LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 25 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 5021 .L6 1930

The Lambeth Conference 193

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 25 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

# THE
# LAMBETH CONFERENCE
# 1930

## ENCYCLICAL LETTER
FROM THE BISHOPS
WITH
## RESOLUTIONS
AND
## REPORTS

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

A

[Printed in Great Britain.]

# CONTENTS

List of the Bishops attending the Conference, arranged according to date of Consecration ... 1

List of the Bishops attending the Conference, arranged according to Provinces ... ... ... 7

Encyclical Letter from the Assembled Bishops ... 15

Resolutions formally adopted by the Conference ... 37

Reports of Committees :—

I. The Christian Doctrine of God ... ... 65

II. The Life and Witness of the Christian Community ... ... ... ... ... 85

III. The Unity of the Church ... ... ... 110

IV. The Anglican Communion ... ... ... 152

V. The Ministry of the Church ... ... ... 164

VI. Youth and its Vocation ... ... ... 188

# LIST OF BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1930

In the arrangement of the following list of Bishops attending the Conference the general order followed is that of the date of Consecration. The Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester and Meath have an ancient priority which has been recognised in the list. The order in which the Metropolitans are placed is based on many different kinds of consideration, and precedence is given this year to Chairmen of Houses of Bishops as such.

1 Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.), 1928 May 1st, 1901.

2 Archbishop of York (Most Rev. W. Temple, D.Litt), 1928. January 25th, 1921.

3 Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.), 1920. February 24th, 1903.

4 Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D.), 1920 December 28th, 1915.

5 Bishop of Brechin, Primus of Scottish Episcopal Church (Most Rev. W. J. F. Robberds, D.D.), 1908 January 6th, 1904.

6 Archbishop of Wales (Most Rev. A. G. Edwards, D.D.), 1920 March 25th, 1889.

7 Bishop of Rhode Island, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A. (Rt. Rev. J. de W. Perry, D.D.) January 6th, 1911.

8 Bishop of Calcutta, Metropolitan of India (Most Rev. F. Westcott, D.D.), 1919 November 30th, 1905.

9 Archbishop of Sydney, Primate of Australia and Tasmania (Most Rev. J. C. Wright, D.D.), 1909. August 24th, 1909.

10 Archbishop of Capetown, Metropolitan of South Africa (Most Rev. W. M. Carter, D.D.), 1909 September 29th, 1891.

11 Primate and Archbishop of New Zealand (Most Rev. A. W. Averill, D.D.), 1925 January 6th, 1910.

12 Archbishop and Primate of the West Indies (Most Rev. E. Hutson, D.D.), 1921 January 15th, 1911.

13 Archbishop of New Westminster (Most Rev. A. U. de Pencier, D.D.), 1925 July 25th, 1910.

14 Archbishop of Melbourne (Most Rev. F. W. Head, D.D.), 1929. November 1st, 1929.

15 Archbishop of Brisbane (Most Rev. G. Sharp, D.D.), 1921 April 25th, 1910.

16 Archbishop of Perth (Most Rev. H. F. Le Fanu, M.A.), 1929 September 21st, 1915.

17 The Chairman of the House of Bishops in Japan (Right Rev. J. McKim, D.D.) June 24th, 1893.

18 The Chairman of the House of Bishops in China (Right Rev. L. H. Roots, D.D.) November 14th, 1904.

19 Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D.) November 30th, 1897.

20 Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. H. H. Henson, D.D.) February 2nd, 1918.

21 Bishop of Winchester (Rt. Rev F. T. Woods, D.D.) September 21st, 1916.

22 Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. J. Orr, D.D.) August 6th, 1923.

23 Assistant Bishop of London (Right Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.) March 25th, 1893.

24 Bishop of Tennessee (Right Rev. T. F. Gailor, D.D.) July 25th, 1893.

25 Assistant Bishop of Birmingham (Right Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, D.D.) September 29th, 1893.

26 Bishop of Rochester (Right Rev. J. R. Harmer, D.D.) May 23rd, 1895.

27 Bishop of Alaska (Right Rev. P. T. Rowe, D.D.) November 30th, 1895.

28 Assistant Bishop of Lincoln (Right Rev. J. E. Hine, D.D.). June 29th, 1896.

29 Bishop of Western North Carolina (Right Rev. J. M. Horner, D.D.) December 28th, 1898.

30 Bishop of Sacramento (Right Rev. W. H. Moreland, D.D.) January 25th, 1899.

31 Assistant Bishop of Rochester (Right Rev. G. L. King, D.D.) June 29th, 1899.

32 Bishop of Indianopolis (Right Rev. J. M. Francis, D.D.) September 21st, 1899.

33 Bishop of Fond du Lac (Right Rev. R. H. Weller, D.D.) November 8th, 1900.

34 Bishop in Argentina (Right Rev. E. F. Every, D.D.) July 13th, 1902.

35 Bishop A. M. Knight, D.D. (Canterbury Assistant). February 24th, 1903.

36 Bishop of Salisbury (Right Rev. St. C. G. A. Donaldson, D.D.) October 28th, 1904.

37 Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness (Right Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D.) December 21st, 1904.

38 Coadjutor Bishop of New Jersey (Right Rev. A. W. Knight, D.D.) December, 21st, 1904.

39 Suffragan Bishop of Southampton (Right Rev. C. H. Boutflower, D.D.) January 25th, 1905.

40 Bishop of Llandaff (Right Rev. J. P. Hughes, D.D.) June 1st, 1905.

41 Bishop of Yukon (Right Rev. I. O. Stringer, D.D.) December 17th, 1905.)

42 Suffragan Bishop of Knaresborough (Right Rev. L. F. M. B. Smith, D.D.) December 27th, 1905.

43 Assistant Bishop of Ely (Right Rev. H. M. E. Price, D.D.) February, 2nd, 1906.

44 BISHOP OF WESTERN MICHIGAN (RIGHT REV. J. N. MCCORMICK, D.D.) February 14th, 1906.

45 BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE (RIGHT REV. W. W. WEBB, D.D.) February 24th, 1906.

46 BISHOP OF CHESTER (RIGHT REV. H. L. PAGET, D.D.) April 25th, 1906.

47 BISHOP OF BRISTOL (RIGHT REV. G. NICKSON, D.D.) June 29th, 1906.

48 BISHOP OF FREDERICTON (RIGHT REV. J. A. RICHARDSON, D.D.) November 30th, 1906.

49 BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES (RIGHT REV. K. MACKENZIE, D.D.) January 25th, 1907.

50 ASSISTANT BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS (RIGHT REV. G. H. LANDER, D.D.) June 29th, 1907.

51 BISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS, DUNKELD AND DUNBLANE (RIGHT REV. C. E. PLUMB, D.D.) March 25th, 1908.

52 ASSISTANT BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER (RIGHT REV. E. J. PALMER, D.D.) May 28th, 1908.

53 BISHOP IN EGYPT AND THE SUDAN (RIGHT REV. LL. H. GWYNNE, D.D.) October 11th, 1908.

54 ASSISTANT BISHOP OF LONDON (RIGHT REV. H. BURY, D.D.) October 11th, 1908.

55 BISHOP OF MONTREAL (RIGHT REV. J. C. FARTHING, D.D.) January 6th, 1909.

56 BISHOP OF TORONTO (RIGHT REV. J. F. SWEENY, D.D.) March 25th, 1909.

57 BISHOP OF THE AMERICAN CHURCHES IN EUROPE (RIGHT REV. N.S. THOMAS, D.D.) May 6th, 1909.

58 BISHOP OF MOOSONEE (RIGHT REV. J. G. ANDERSON, D.D.) May 16th 1909.

59 BISHOP OF MAINE (RIGHT REV. B. BREWSTER, D.D.) June 17th, 1909.

60 BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS (RIGHT REV. M. B. FURSE, D.D.) June 29th, 1909.

61 BISHOP OF SHEFFIELD (RIGHT REV. L. H. BURROWS, D.D.) July 11th, 1909.

62 SUFFRAGAN BISHOP OF BURNLEY (RIGHT REV. H. HENN, D.D.) July 11th, 1909.

63 BISHOP OF CHRISTCHURCH (RIGHT REV. C. WEST-WATSON, D.D.) September 21st, 1909.

64 BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE (RIGHT REV. M. T. MCA. HARDING, D.D.) September 21st, 1909.

65 SUFFRAGAN BISHOP OF WHALLEY (Right Rev. A. G. RAWSTORNE, D.D.) September 21st, 1909.

66 BISHOP IN SOUTH JAPAN (RIGHT REV. A. LEA, D.D.) November 30th, 1909.

67 BISHOP OF NORWICH (RIGHT REV. B. POLLOCK, D.D.) April 25th, 1910.

68 BISHOP OF LICHFIELD (RIGHT REV. J. A. KEMPTHORNE, D.D.) May 16th, 1910.

69 BISHOP OF SAN JOAQUIN (RIGHT REV. L. C. SANFORD, D.D.) January 25th, 1911.

70 Bishop in Corea (Right Rev. M. N. Trollope, D.D.) July 25th, 1911.

71 Bishop of Taunton (Right Rev. C. F. de Salis, D.D.) July 25th, 1911.

72 Bishop of George (Right Rev. H. B. Sidwell, D.D.) September 29th, 1911.

73 Bishop of Western Massachusetts (Right Rev. T. F. Davies, D.D.) October 18th, 1911.

74 Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. T. J. Garland, D.D.) October 28th, 1911.

75 Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W. (Right Rev. G. M. Long, D.D.) November 30th, 1911. d. July 9th, 1930.

76 Suffragan Bishop of Kensington (Right Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D.) December 28th, 1911.

77 Bishop of Uganda (Right Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D.) January 25th, 1912.

78 Bishop of Ottawa (Right Rev. J. C. Roper, D.D.) February 24th, 1912.

79 Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross (Right Rev. C. B. Dowse, D.D.) June 11th, 1912.

80 Assistant Bishop of Newcastle (Right Rev. C. J. Wood, D.D.) July 14th, 1912.

81 Bishop of Nelson (Right Rev. W. C. Sadlier, D.D.) July 21st, 1912.

82 Bishop in Mid-Japan (Right Rev. H. J. Hamilton, D.D.) October 18th, 1912.

83 Bishop of Iowa (Right Rev. H. S. Longley, D.D.) October 23rd, 1912.

84 Bishop of Athabasca (Right Rev. E. F. Robins, D.D.) November 24th, 1912.

85 Bishop of Dornakal (Right Rev. V. S. Azariah, D.D.) December 29th, 1912.

86 Bishop of North Queensland (Right Rev. J. O. Feetham, D.D.) April 25th, 1913.

87 Assistant Bishop of Peterborough (Right Rev. N. McL. Lang, D.D.) May 1st, 1913.

88 Suffragan Bishop of Massachusetts (Right Rev. S. G. Babcock, D.D.) June 17th, 1913.

89 Bishop of Jamaica (Right Rev. G. F. C. de Carteret, D.D.) October 18th, 1913.

90 Bishop in North China (Right Rev. F. L. Norris, D.D.) January 1st, 1914.

91 Assistant Bishop of Oxford (Right Rev. E. D. Shaw, D.D.) January 1st, 1914.

92 Bishop of New Mexico (Right Rev. F. B. Howden, D.D.) January 14th, 1914.

93 Bishop of Edmonton (Right Rev. H. A. Gray, D.D.) March 25th, 1914.

94 Bishop of Mauritius (Right Rev. C. H. Golding-Bird, D.D.) April 25th, 1914.

95 Bishop of Northern Rhodesia (Right Rev. A. J. W. May, D.D.) April 25th, 1914.

96 Bishop in Jerusalem (Right Rev. R. MacInnes, D.D.) October 28th, 1914.
97 Bishop of Cuba (Right Rev. H. R. Hulse, D.D.) January 12th, 1915.
98 Bishop of New Jersey (Right Rev. P. Matthews, D.D.) January 25th, 1915.
99 Bishop of Quebec (Right Rev. L. W. Williams, D.D.) January 25th, 1915.
100 Bishop of Michigan (Right Rev. H. Page, D.D.) January 28th, 1915.
101 Bishop of Kootenay (Right Rev. A. J. Doull, D.D.) February 24th, 1915.
102 Bishop of Goulburn (Right Rev. L. B. Radford, D.D.) August 24th, 1915.
103 Bishop of New Guinea (Right Rev. H. Newton, D.D.) September 21st, 1915.
104 Bishop of Swansea and Brecon (Right Rev. E. L. Bevan, D.D.) September 29th, 1915.
105 Suffragan Bishop of Stafford (Right Rev. L. P. Crawfurd, D.D.) September 29th, 1915.
106 Bishop of Newark (Right Rev. W. R. Stearly, D.D.) October 21st, 1915.
107 Bishop of Grahamstown (Right Rev. F. R. Phelps, D.D.) October 31st, 1915.
108 Bishop of Connecticut (Right Rev. E. C. Acheson, D.D.) November 4th, 1915.
109 Bishop of Madras (Right Rev. E. H. M. Waller, D.D.) November 28th, 1915.
110 Bishop of Newcastle (Right Rev. H. E. Bilbrough, D.D.) February 24th, 1916.
111 Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Right Rev. J. I. Peacocke, D.D.) April 25th, 1916.
112 Bishop of Kansas (Right Rev. J. Wise, D.D.) October 28th, 1916.
113 Bishop of British Columbia (Right Rev. C. de V. Schofield, D.D.) November 30th, 1916.
114 Bishop of South Dakota (Right Rev. H. L. Burleson, D.D.) December 14th, 1916.
115 Bishop of Exeter (Right Rev. the Lord William Cecil, D.D.) December 28th, 1916.
116 Bishop of Colorado (Right Rev. I. P. Johnson, D.D.) January 1st, 1917.
117 Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney (Right Rev. F. L. Deane, D.D.) May 1st, 1917.
118 Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown (Right Rev. J. O. Nash, D.D.) May 17th, 1917.
119 Bishop of British Honduras (Right Rev. E. A. Dunn, D.D.) August 12th, 1917.
120 Bishop of the Windward Islands (Right Rev. A. P. Berkeley, D.D.) August 12th, 1917.
121 Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak (Right Rev. E. D. L. Danson, D.D.) September 21st, 1917.

122 Bishop of Atlanta (Right Rev. H. J. Mikell, D.D.) November 1st, 1917.

123 Bishop of Gippsland (Right Rev. G. H. Cranswick, D.D.) November 1st, 1917.

124 Bishop of Eastern Oregon (Right Rev. W. P. Remington, D.D.) January 10th, 1918.

125 Suffragan Bishop of Woolwich (Right Rev. W. W. Hough, D.D.) February 2nd, 1918.

126 Bishop of Newfoundland (Right Rev. W. C. White, D.D.) March 10th, 1918.

127 Bishop of Mombasa (Right Rev. R. S. Heywood, D.D.) April 21st, 1918.

128 Bishop of Trinidad (Right Rev. A. H. Anstey, D.D.) June 29th, 1918.

129 Bishop in Fukien (Right Rev. J. Hind, D.D.) October 18th, 1918.

130 Bishop of Hereford (Right Rev. M. L. Smith, D.D.) November 1st, 1918.

131 Bishop of Worcester (Right Rev. E. H. Pearce, Litt.D.) February 24th, 1919.

132 Coadjutor Bishop of Mississippi (Right Rev. W. M. Green, D.D.) May 29th, 1919.

133 Bishop of Cashel, Emly, Waterford and Lismore (Right Rev. R. Miller, D.D.) June 11th, 1919.

134 Bishop of Barbados (Right Rev. D. W. Bentley, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.

135 Bishop of the Falkland Islands (Right Rev. N. S. de Jersey, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.

136 Bishop of Nassau (Right Rev. R. G. Shedden, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.

137 Suffragan Bishop of Barking (Right Rev. J. T. Inskip, D.D.) June 24th, 1919.

138 Bishop of Tasmania (Right Rev. R. S. Hay, D.D.) August 24th, 1919.

139 Bishop of Nebraska (Right Rev. E. V. Shayler, D.D.) September 11th, 1919.

140 Bishop of Manchester (Right Rev. F. S. G. Warman, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.

141 Bishop of Southwark (Right Rev. C. F. Garbett, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.

142 Bishop of Southwell (Right Rev. H. Mosley, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.

143 Bishop of Lagos (Right Rev. F. Melville Jones, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.

144 Bishop in Persia (Right Rev. J. H. Linton, D.D.) October 18th, 1919.

145 Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore (Right Rev. C. T. P. Grierson, D.D.) October 28th, 1919.

146 Bishop of California (Right Rev. E. L. Parsons, D.D.) November 5th, 1919.

147 Bishop of Kalgoorlie (Right Rev. W. E. Elsey, D.D.) November 9th, 1919.

148 Bishop of Nagpur (Right Rev. A. Wood, D.D.) December 7th, 1919.

149 Bishop of Lincoln (Right Rev. W. S. Swayne, D.D.) January 6th, 1920.

150 Bishop of Bradford (Right Rev. A. W. T. Perowne, D.D.) February 2nd, 1920.

151 Bishop of Bendigo (Right Rev. D. Baker, D.D.) February 2nd, 1920.

152 Bishop of Panama Canal Zone (Right Rev. J. C. Morris, D.D.) February 5th, 1920.

153 Bishop of South Western Virginia (Right Rev. R. C. Jett, D.D.) March 24th, 1920.

154 Bishop of Pretoria (Right Rev. N. S. Talbot, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.

155 Bishop of Victoria, Hongkong (Right Rev. C. R. Duppuy, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.

156 Bishop H. K. Southwell, D.D. (Chichester Assistant). June 24th, 1920.

157 Suffragan Bishop of Warrington (Right Rev. H. Gresford Jones, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.

158 Assistant Bishop on the Niger (Right Rev. A. W. Howells, D.D.) June 24th, 1920.

159 Bishop of Carlisle (Right Rev. H. H. Williams, D.D.) August 24th, 1920.

160 Bishop of Oxford (Right Rev. T. B. Strong, D.D.) August 24th, 1920.

161 Bishop of Easton (Right Rev. G. W. Davenport, D.D.) September 15th, 1920.

162 Bishop of Los Angeles (Right Rev. W. B. Stevens, D.D.) October 12th, 1920.

163 Bishop of Western New York (Right Rev. D. L. Ferris, D.D.) October 13th, 1920.

164 Bishop of Delaware (Right Rev. P. Cook, D.D.) October 14th, 1920.

165 Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin (Right Rev. J. G. F. Day, D.D.) November 1st, 1920.

166 Bishop of Guildford (Right Rev. J. H. Greig, D.D.) January 25th, 1921.

167 Suffragan Bishop of Buckingham (Right Rev. P. H. Eliot, D.D.) January 25th, 1921.

168 Bishop of Ballarat (Right Rev. P. C. T. Crick, D.D.) February 24th, 1921.

169 Bishop of Natal (Right Rev. L. N. Fisher, D.D.) April 3rd, 1921.

170 Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway (Right Rev. E. T. S. Reid, D.D.) June 24th, 1921.

171 Bishop of Bloemfontein (Right Rev. W. J. Carey, D.D.) June 29th, 1921.

172 Bishop of Liverpool (Right Rev. A. A. David, D.D.) July 25th, 1921.

173 Bishop in Shantung (Right Rev. T. A. Scott, D.D.) July 25th, 1921.

174 Bishop of Erie (Right Rev. J. C. Ward, D.D.) September 22nd, 1921.

175 Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe (Right Rev. H. V. White, D.D.) October 18th, 1921.

176 Bishop of Guiana (Right Rev. O. H. Parry, D.D.) October 18th, 1921.

177 Bishop of Bath and Wells (Right Rev. St. J. B. Wynne Willson, D.D.) November 1st, 1921.

178 Bishop of Grafton (Right Rev. J. W. Ashton, D.D.) November 30th, 1921.

179 Bishop of Keewatin (Right Rev. A. D. A. Dewdney, D.D.) December 11th 1921.

180 Bishop of Bangor (Right Rev. C. A. H. Green, D.D.) December 21st, 1921.

181 Bishop of Blackburn (Right Rev. P. M. Herbert, D.D.) January 25th, 1922.

182 Bishop on the Niger (Right Rev. B. Lasbrey, D.D.) January 25th, 1922.

183 Bishop in South Tokyo (Right Rev. S. Heaslett, D.D.) January 25th, 1922.

184 Bishop of Saskatchewan (Right Rev. G. E. Lloyd, D.D.) March 12th, 1922.

185 Bishop of Carpentaria (Right Rev. S. H. Davies, D.D.) March 25th, 1922.

186 Bishop of Coventry (Right Rev. C. L. Carr, D.D.) June 24th, 1922.

187 Bishop in Western China (Right Rev. H. W. K. Mowll, D.D.) June 24th, 1922.

188 Suffragan Bishop of Colchester (Right Rev. T. A. Chapman, D.D.) June 24th, 1922.

189 Bishop of Johannesburg (Right Rev. A. B. L. Karney, D.D.) July 25th, 1922.

190 Bishop of Alabama (Right Rev. W. G. McDowell, D.D.) October 20th, 1922.

191 Bishop of Albany (Right Rev. G. A. Oldham, D.D.) October 24th, 1922.

192 Suffragan Bishop of South Dakota (Right Rev. W. B. Roberts, D.D.) December 6th, 1922.

193 Bishop of Gloucester (Right Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D.) January 25th, 1923.

194 Bishop of Pittsburgh (Right Rev. A. Mann, D.D.) January 25th, 1923.

195 Suffragan Bishop of Plymouth (Right Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, D.D.) January 25th, 1923.

196 Bishop in Polynesia (Right Rev. L. S. Kempthorne, M.A.) March 4th, 1923.

197 Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (Right Rev. E. H. Etheridge, D.D.) April 11th, 1923.

198 Bishop in Kwangsi-Hunan (Right Rev. J. Holden, D.D.) July 25th, 1923.

199 Bishop of Rangoon (Right Rev. N. H. Tubbs, D.D.) July 25th, 1923.

200 Bishop of Clogher (Right Rev. J. MacManaway, D.D.) August 6th, 1923.

201 Bishop of Washington (Right Rev. J. E. Freeman, D.D.) September 29th, 1923.

202 Assistant Bishop of Bloemfontein (Right Rev. S. J. Haynes, D.D.) October 2nd, 1923.

203 Suffragan Bishop of Whitby (Right Rev. H. St. J. S. Woollcombe, D.D.) October 18th, 1923.

204 Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Right Rev. W. G. Whittingham, D.D.) November 1st, 1923.

205 Bishop of Truro (Right Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.) November 1st, 1923.

206 Bishop of Sierra Leone (Right Rev. G. W. Wright, D.D.) November 1st, 1923.

207 Bishop of Bethlehem (Right Rev. F. W. Sterrett, D.D.) November 9th, 1923.

208 Suffragan Bishop of Hulme (Right Rev. J. C. Hill, D.D.) January 25th, 1924.

209 Bishop of Leicester (Right Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, D.D.) February 2nd, 1924.

210 Bishop of Accra (Right Rev. J. O. Aglionby, D.D.) February 2nd, 1924.

211 Bishop of Damaraland (Right Rev. N. W. Fogarty, D.D.) March 2nd, 1924.

212 Bishop of Ely (Right Rev. L. J. White-Thomson, D.D.) March 25th, 1924.

213 Bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora, Clonfert and Kilmacduagh (Right Rev. H. E. Patton, D.D.) May 1st, 1924.

214 Bishop of Colombo (Right Rev. M. R. Carpenter-Garnier, D.D.) June 24th, 1924.

215 Suffragan Bishop of Jarrow (Right Rev. S. K. Knight, D.D.) July 25th, 1924.

216 Bishop of Brandon (Right Rev. W. W. H. Thomas, D.D.) September 7th, 1924.

217 Bishop of Birmingham (Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, Sc.D.) September 29th, 1924.

218 Coadjutor Bishop of Nova Scotia (Right Rev. J. HacKenley, D.D.) January 6th, 1925.

219 Bishop of Vermont (Right Rev. S. B. Booth, D.D.) February 17th, 1925.

220 Bishop of Travancore and Cochin (Right Rev. E. A. L. Moore, D.D.) February 24th, 1925.

221 Bishop of Nasik (Right Rev. P. H. Loyd, D.D.) March 22nd, 1925.

222 Coadjutor Bishop of Ohio (Right Rev. W. L. Rogers, D.D.) April 30th, 1925.

223 Bishop of Northern Indiana (Right Rev. C. Gray, D.D.) May 1st, 1925.

224 Coadjutor Bishop of Milwaukee (Right Rev. B. F. P. Ivins, D.D.) May 7th, 1925.

225 Bishop of Bermuda (Right Rev. A. Heber Browne, D.D.) June 11th, 1925.

226 Bishop of Zanzibar (Right Rev. T. H. Birley, D.D.) June 11th, 1925.

227 Assistant Bishop of Lagos (Right Rev. A. W. Smith, D.D.) June 11th, 1925.

228 Bishop of Niagara (Right Rev. D. T. Owen, D.D.) June 24th, 1925.

229 Bishop of Melanesia (Right Rev. F. M. Molyneux, M.A.) August 9th, 1925.

230 Bishop of Cariboo (Right Rev. W. R. Adams, D.D.) September 29th, 1925.

231 Bishop in Kobe (Right Rev. J. B. Simpson, D.D.) September 29th, 1925.

232 Bishop of Riverina (Right Rev. R. C. Halse, M.A.) September 29th, 1925.

233 Bishop of Southern Rhodesia (Right Rev. E. F. Paget, M.A.) September 29th, 1925.

234 Bishop of Long Island (Right Rev. E. M. Stires, D.D.) November 24th, 1925.

235 Bishop of Liberia (Right Rev. R. Campbell, D.D.) November 30th, 1925.

236 Bishop of Southern Brazil (Right Rev. W. M. M. Thomas, D.D.) December 28th, 1925.

237 Bishop of Idaho (Right Rev. M. S. Barnwell, D.D.) December 30th, 1925.

238 Bishop of Ripon (Right Rev. E. A. Burroughs, D.D.) January 6th, 1926.

239 Bishop of Mexico (Right Rev. F. W. Creighton, D.D.) January 12th, 1926.

240 Bishop in Madagascar (Right Rev. R. S. M. O'Ferrall, D.D.) March 25th, 1926.

241 Bishop B. O. F. Heywood, M.A. (York Assistant) March 25th, 1926.

242 Suffragan Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness (Right Rev. H. S. Pelham, M.A.) March 25th, 1926.

243 Suffragan Bishop of Fulham (Right Rev. B. S. Batty, M.A.) March 25th, 1926.

244 Bishop of Willochra (Right Rev. R. Thomas, D.D.) April 6th, 1926.

245 Bishop of Kyoto (Right Rev. S. H. Nichols) April 13th, 1926.

246 Bishop of New Hampshire (Right Rev. J. T. Dallas, D.D.) May 4th, 1926.

247 Bishop on the Upper Nile (Right Rev. A. L. Kitching, M.A.) June 29th, 1926.

248 Bishop of Ontario (Right Rev. C. A. Seager, D.D.) August 24th, 1926.

249 Bishop of Algoma (Right Rev. R. R. Smith, D.D.) September 21st, 1926.

250 Bishop of Masasi (Right Rev. W. V. Lucas, M.A.) September 29th, 1926.

251 Bishop of St. Arnaud (Right Rev. M. C. James, D.D.) September 29th, 1926.

252 Assistant Bishop of Corea (Right Rev. H. J. Embling, M.A.) September 29th, 1926.

253 Bishop of Chota Nagpur (Right Rev. K. W. S. Kennedy, D.D.) December 12th, 1926.

254 Bishop of Waikato (Right Rev. C. A. Cherrington, B.D.) December 12th, 1926.

255 Suffragan Bishop of Middleton (Right Rev. R. G. Parsons, D.D.) January 25th, 1927.

256 Bishop of St. David's (Right Rev. D. L. Prosser, M.A.) February 2nd, 1927.

257 Bishop of Calgary (Right Rev. L. R. Sherman, M.A.) February 24th, 1927.

258 Suffragan Bishop of Kingston-on-Thames (Right Rev. F. O. T. Hawkes, M.A.) February 24th, 1927.

259 Bishop of Peterborough (Right Rev. C. M. Blagden, D.D.) March 25th, 1927.

260 Bishop of Wangaratta (Right Rev. J. S. Hart, M.A.) June 29th, 1927.

261 Bishop of Portsmouth (Right Rev. E. N. Lovett, D.D.) July 25th, 1927.

262 Bishop of Derby (Right Rev. E. C. Pearce, D.D.) October 18th, 1927.

263 Bishop of Gibraltar (Right Rev. F. C. N. Hicks, D.D.) October 18th, 1927.

264 Bishop of Singapore (Right Rev. B. C. Roberts, M.A.) October 18th, 1927.

265 Suffragan Bishop of Malmesbury (Right Rev. R. E. Ramsay, LL.D.) October 18th, 1927.

266 Bishop of Central Tanganyika (Right Rev. G. A. Chambers, D.D.) November 1st, 1927.

267 Bishop in Hokkaido (Right Rev. G. J. Walsh, D.D.) November, 1st 1927.

268 Suffragan Bishop of Dover (Right Rev. J. V. Macmillan, D.D.). November 1st, 1927.

269 Coadjutor Bishop of Bathurst (Right Rev. A. L. Wylde, M.A.) November 1st, 1927.

270 Bishop of Tuam, Killala and Achonry (Right Rev. J. M. Harden, D.D.) January 6th, 1928.

271 Bishop of Rockhampton (Right Rev. F. L. Ash, B.A.) February 3rd, 1928.

272 Bishop of Bathurst (Right Rev. H. Crotty, D.D.) March 26th, 1928.

273 Suffragan Bishop of Sherborne (Right Rev. G. B. Allen, D.D.) May 6th, 1928.

274 Assistant Bishop of Jamaica (Right Rev. W. G. Hardie, M.A.) May 6th, 1928.

275 Bishop of Sodor and Man (Right Rev. W. Stanton Jones, D.D.) June 11th, 1928.

276 Bishop of Lucknow (Right Rev. C. J. G. Saunders, M.A.) July 25th, 1928.
277 Bishop of Tokyo (Right Rev. P. Y. Matsui, D.D.) July 25th, 1928.
278 Bishop of Kimberley (Right Rev. T. S. Gibson, M.A.) August 24th, 1928.
279 Bishop of Caledonia (Right Rev. G. A. Rix, D.D.) September 9th, 1928.
280 Suffragan Bishop of Stepney (Right Rev. C. E. Curzon, M.A.) October 18th, 1928.
281 Bishop of Wakefield (Right Rev. J. B. Seaton, D.D.) November 1st, 1928.
282 Bishop of Monmouth (Right Rev. G. C. Joyce, D.D.) November 30th, 1928.
283 Suffragan Bishop of Maenan (Right Rev. T. Lloyd, B.A.) November 30th, 1928.
284 Bishop of Chekiang (Right Rev. J. Curtis, B.D.) January 6th, 1929.
285 Bishop of Chelmsford (Right Rev. H. A. Wilson, D.D.) January 25th, 1929.
286 Bishop of Nevada (Right Rev. T. Jenkins, D.D.) January 25th, 1929.
287 Bishop of Mackenzie River (Right Rev. W. A. Geddes, D.D.) February 3rd, 1929.
288 Assistant Bishop of Honan (Right Rev. P. Lindel Tsen, S.T.D.) February 24th, 1929.
289 Bishop of Tinnevelly (Right Rev. F. J. Western, M.A.) March 21st, 1929.
290 Bishop of North-West Australia (Right Rev. J. Frewer, D.D.) April 9th, 1929.
291 Bishop of Eau Claire (Right Rev. F. E. Wilson, D.D.) May 1st, 1929.
292 Bishop of Chichester (Right Rev. G. K. A. Bell, D.D.) June 11th, 1929.
293 Bishop of Edinburgh (Right Rev. H. S. Reid, M.A.) June 11th, 1929.
294 Suffragan Bishop of Willesden (Right Rev. G. V. Smith, M.A.) July 25th, 1929.
295 Bishop of Lebombo (Right Rev. B. W. Peacey, M.A.) September 26th, 1929.
296 Coadjutor Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. F. M. Taitt) October 4th, 1929.
297 Suffragan Bishop of Lewes (Right Rev. H. M. Hordern, M.A.) November 1st, 1929.
298 Bishop of Bombay (Right Rev. R. Dyke Acland, M.A.) November 6th, 1929.
299 Bishop of Armidale (Right Rev. J. S. Moyes, M.A.) November 30th, 1929.
300 Suffragan Bishop of Grantham (Right Rev. E. M. Blackie, B.A.) January 25th, 1930.
301 Bishop of Zululand (Right Rev. C. A. W. Aylen, M.A.) February 2nd, 1930.

302 Bishop of Kilmore and Elphin and Ardagh (Right Rev. A. W. Barton, B.D.) May 1st, 1930.
303 Suffragan Bishop of Croydon (Right Rev. E. S. Woods, M.A.) May 1st, 1930.
304 Coadjutor Bishop of Southern Ohio (Right Rev. H. Hobson.) May 1st, 1930.
305 Coadjutor Bishop of Missouri (Right Rev. W. Scarlett, D.D.) May 6th, 1930.
306 Coadjutor Bishop of Chicago (Right Rev. G. Craig Stewart, A.M.) June 18th, 1930.
307 Bishop of Nyasaland (Right Rev. G. W. Douglas, D.D.) June 24th, 1930.
308 Suffragan Bishop of Crediton (Right Rev. W. F. Surtees, M.A.) June 24th, 1930.

# LIST OF BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1930, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES.

- Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. C. G. Lang, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Dover (Right Rev. J. V. Macmillan, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Croydon (Right Rev. E. S. Woods, M.A.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. A. M. Knight, D.D.).
- Bishop of London (Right Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Stepney (Right Rev. C. E. Curzon, M.A.).
    - Bishop of Kensington (Right Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Willesden (Right Rev. G. V. Smith, M.A.).
    - Bishop of Fulham (Right Rev. B. S. Batty, M.A.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. W. W. Perrin, D.D.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. H. Bury, D.D.).
- Bishop of Winchester (Right Rev. F. T. Woods, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Southampton (Right Rev. C. H. Boutflower, D.D.).
- Bishop of Bath and Wells (Right Rev. St. J. B. Wynne Willson, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Taunton (Right Rev. C. F. de Salis, D.D.).
- Bishop of Birmingham (Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, Sc.D.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, D.D.).
- Bishop of Bristol (Right Rev. G. Nickson, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Malmesbury (Right Rev. R. E. Ramsay, LL.D.).
- Bishop of Chelsmford (Right Rev. H. A. Wilson, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Barking (Right Rev. J. T. Inskip, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Colchester (Right Rev. T. A. Chapman, D.D.).
- Bishop of Chichester (Right Rev. G. K. A. Bell, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Lewes (Right Rev. H. M. Hordern, M.A.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. H. K. Southwell, D.D.).
- Bishop of Coventry (Right Rev. C. L. Carr, D.D.).
- Bishop of Derby (Right Rev. E. C. Pearce, D.D.).
- Bishop of Ely (Right Rev. L. J. White-Thomson, D.D.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. H. M. E. Price, D.D.).
- Bishop of Exeter (Right Rev. Lord William Cecil, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Crediton (Right Rev. W. F. Surtees, M.A.).
    - Bishop of Plymouth (Right Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, D.D.).
- Bishop of Gloucester (Right Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. E. J. Palmer, D.D.).
- Bishop of Guildford (Right Rev. J. H. Greig, D.D.).
- Bishop of Hereford (Right Rev. M. Linton Smith, D.D.).
- Bishop of Leicester (Right Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, D.D.).
- Bishop of Lichfield (Right Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Stafford (Right Rev. L. P. Crawfurd, D.D.).
- Bishop of Lincoln (Right Rev. W. S. Swayne, D.D.).
    - Bishop of Grantham (Right Rev. E. M. Blackie, B.A.).
    - Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. J. E. Hine, D.D.).
- Bishop of Norwich (Right Rev. B. Pollock, D.D.).

BISHOP OF OXFORD (RIGHT REV. T. B. STRONG, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF BUCKINGHAM (RIGHT REV. P. H. ELIOT, M.A.).
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. E. D. SHAW, D.D.).
BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH (RIGHT REV. C. M. BLAGDEN, D.D.)
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. N. McL. LANG, D.D.).
BISHOP OF PORTSMOUTH (RIGHT REV. E. N. LOVETT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF ROCHESTER (RIGHT REV. J. R. HARMER, D.D.).
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. G. L. KING, D.D.)
BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS (RIGHT REV. M. B. FURSE, D.D.).
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. G. H. LANDER, D.D.).
BISHOP OF ST. EDMUNDSBURY AND IPSWICH (RIGHT REV. W. G. WHITTINGHAM, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SALISBURY (RIGHT REV. ST. C. G. A. DONALDSON, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF SHERBORNE (RIGHT REV. G. B. ALLEN, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK (RIGHT REV. C. F. GARBETT, D.D.)
  BISHOP OF KINGSTON (RIGHT REV. F. O. T. HAWKES, M.A.).
  BISHOP OF WOOLWICH (RIGHT REV. W. W. HOUGH, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL (RIGHT REV. H. MOSLEY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF TRURO (RIGHT REV. W. H. FRERE, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WORCESTER (RIGHT REV. E. H. PEARCE, LITT.D.).

ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (MOST REV. W. TEMPLE, D.LITT.).
  BISHOP OF WHITBY (RIGHT REV. H. ST. J. S. WOOLLCOMBE, D.D.)
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. B. O. F. HEYWOOD, M.A.).
BISHOP OF DURHAM (RIGHT REV. H. H. HENSON, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF JARROW (RIGHT REV. S. K. KNIGHT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF BLACKBURN (RIGHT REV. P. M. HERBERT, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF BURNLEY (RIGHT REV. H. HENN, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF WHALLEY (RIGHT REV. A. G. RAWSTORNE, D.D.).
BISHOP OF BRADFORD (RIGHT REV. A. W. T. PEROWNE, D.D.).
BISHOP OF CARLISLE (RIGHT REV. H. H. WILLIAMS, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF BARROW-IN-FURNESS (RIGHT REV. H. S. PELHAM, M.A.).
BISHOP OF CHESTER (RIGHT REV. H. L. PAGET, D.D.).
BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL (RIGHT REV. A. A. DAVID, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF WARRINGTON (RIGHT REV. H. GRESFORD JONES, D.D.).
BISHOP OF MANCHESTER (RIGHT REV. F. S. G. WARMAN, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF HULME (RIGHT REV. J. C. HILL, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF MIDDLETON (RIGHT REV. R. G. PARSONS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE (RIGHT REV. H. E. BILBROUGH, D.D.).
  ASSISTANT BISHOP (RIGHT REV. C. J. WOOD, D.D.).
BISHOP OF RIPON (RIGHT REV. E. A. BURROUGHS, D.D.).
  BISHOP OF KNARESBOROUGH (RIGHT REV. L. F. M. B. SMITH, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SHEFFIELD (RIGHT REV. L. H. BURROWS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD (RIGHT REV. J. B. SEATON, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN (RIGHT REV. W. STANTON JONES, D.D.).

Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, D.D.).
Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. J. Orr, D.D.).
Bishop of Clogher (Right Rev. J. MacManaway, D.D.).
Bishop of Derry and Raphoe (Right Rev. J. I. Peacocke, D.D.).
Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore (Right Rev. C. T. P. Grierson, D.D.).
Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh (Right Rev. A. W. Barton, B.D.).
Bishop of Tuam, Killala and Achonry (Right Rev. J. M. Harden, D.D.).

Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. J. A. F. Gregg, D.D.).
Bishop of Cashel, Emly, Waterford and Lismore (Right Rev. R. Miller, D.D.).
Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross (Right Rev. C. B. Dowse, D.D.).
Bishop of Killaloe, Kilfenora, Clonfert and Kilmacduagh (Right Rev. H. E. Patton, D.D.).
Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe (Right Rev. H. V. White, D.D.).
Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Leighlin (Right Rev. J. G. F. Day, D.D.).

Bishop of Brechin *Primus* (Most Rev. W. J. F Robberds, D.D.).
Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney (Right Rev. F. L. Deane, D.D.).
Bishop of Argyll and the Isles (Right Rev. K. Mackenzie, D.D.).
Bishop of Edinburgh (Right Rev. H. S. Reid, M.A.).
Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway (Right Rev. E. T. S. Reid, D.D.).
Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness (Right Rev. A. J. Maclean, D.D.).
Bishop of S. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane (Right Rev. C. E. Plumb, D.D.).

Archbishop of Wales (Most Rev. A. G. Edwards, D.D.).
 Bishop of Maenan (Right Rev. T. Lloyd, B.A.).
Bishop of Bangor (Right Rev. C. A. H. Green, D.D.).
Bishop of Llandaff (Right Rev. J. P. Hughes, D.D.).
Bishop of Monmouth (Right Rev. G. C. Joyce, D.D.).
Bishop of S. Davids (Right Rev. D. L. Prosser, M.A.).
Bishop of Swansea and Brecon (Right Rev. E. L. Bevan, D.D.).

Bishop of Rhode Island, *Presiding Bishop* (Right Rev. J. de W. Perry, D.D.).
Bishop of Alabama (Right Rev. W. G. McDowell, D.D.).
Bishop of Alaska (Right Rev. P. T. Rowe, D.D.).

Bishop of Albany (Right Rev. G. A. Oldham, D.D.).
Bishop of Atlanta (Right Rev. H. J. Mikell, D.D.).
Bishop of Bethlehem (Right Rev. F. W. Sterrett, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Chicago (Right Rev. G. Craig Stewart, A.M.).
Bishop of California (Right Rev. E. L. Parsons, D.D.).
Bishop of Colorado (Right Rev. I. P. Johnson, D.D.
Bishop of Connecticut (Right Rev. E. C. Acheson, D.D.).
Bishop of Cuba (Right Rev. H. R. Hulse, D.D.).
Bishop of Delaware (Right Rev. P. Cook, D.D.).
Bishop of Eastern Oregon (Right Rev. W. P. Remington, D.D.).
Bishop of Easton (Right Rev. G. W. Davenport, D.D.).
Bishop of Eau Claire (Right Rev. F. E. Wilson, D.D.).
Bishop of Erie (Right Rev. J. C. Ward, D.D.).
Bishop in Charge of European Churches (Right Rev. N. S. Thomas).
Bishop of Fond du Lac (Right Rev. R. H. Weller, D.D.).
Bishop of Idaho (Right Rev. M. Barnwell, D.D.).
Bishop of Indianapolis (Right Rev. J. M. Francis, D.D.).
Bishop of Iowa (Right Rev. H. S. Langley, D.D.).
Bishop of Kansas (Right Rev. J. Wise, D.D.).
Bishop of Kyoto (Right Rev. S. H. Nichols.).
Bishop of Liberia (Right Rev. R. Campbell, D.D.).
Bishop of Long Island (Right Rev. E. M. Stires, D.D.).
Bishop of Los Angeles (Right Rev. W. B. Stevens, D.D.).
Bishop of Maine (Right Rev. B. Brewster, D.D.).
Suffragan Bishop of Massachusetts (Right Rev. S. G. Babcock, D.D.).
Bishop of Mexico (Right Rev. F. W. Creighton, D.D.).
Bishop of Michigan (Right Rev. H. Page, D.D.).
Bishop of Milwaukee (Right Rev. W. W. Webb, D.D.).
    Coadjutor Bishop of Milwaukee (Right Rev. B. F. P. Ivins, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Mississippi (Right Rev. W. M. Green, D.D.).
Bishop of Nebraska (Right Rev. E. V. Shayler, D.D.).
Bishop of Nevada (Right Rev. T. Jenkins, D.D.).
Bishop of New Hampshire (Right Rev. J. T. Dallas, D.D.).
Bishop of New Jersey (Right Rev. P. Matthews, D.D.).
    Coadjutor Bishop of New Jersey (Right Rev. A. W. Knight, D.D.).
Bishop of New Mexico (Right Rev. F. B. Howden, D.D.).
Bishop of Newark (Right Rev. W. R. Stearly, D.D.).
Bishop of Northern Indiana (Right Rev. C. Gray, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Ohio (Right Rev. W. L. Rogers, D.D.).
Bishop of Panama Canal Zone (Right Rev. J. C. Morris, D.D.).
Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. T. J. Garland, D.D.).
    Coadjutor Bishop of Pennsylvania (Right Rev. F. M. Taitt).
Bishop of Pittsburgh (Right Rev. A. Mann, D.D.).
Bishop of Sacramento (Right Rev. W. H. Moreland, D.D.).
Bishop of San Joaquin (Right Rev. L. C. Sanford, D.D.).

BISHOP OF SOUTHERN BRAZIL (RIGHT REV. W. M. M. THOMAS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SOUTH DAKOTA (RIGHT REV. H. L. BURLESON, D.D.).
    SUFFRAGAN BISHOP OF SOUTH DAKOTA (RIGHT REV. W. B. ROBERTS, D.D.).
COADJUTOR BISHOP OF SOUTHERN OHIO (RIGHT REV. H. HOBSON).
BISHOP OF SOUTH WESTERN VIRGINIA (RIGHT REV. R. C. JETT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF TENNESSEE (RIGHT REV. T. F. GAILOR, D.D.).
    COADJUTOR BISHOP OF TENNESSEE (RIGHT REV. J. M. MAXON, D.D.).
BISHOP OF VERMONT (RIGHT REV. S. B. BOOTH, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WASHINGTON (RIGHT REV. J. E. FREEMAN, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS (RIGHT REV. T. F. DAVIES, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WESTERN MICHIGAN (RIGHT REV. J. N. MCCORMICK, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK (RIGHT REV. D. L. FERRIS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA (RIGHT REV. J. M. HORNER, D.D.).

---

BISHOP OF CALCUTTA, *Metropolitan* (MOST REV. F. WESTCOTT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF BOMBAY (RIGHT REV. R. DYKE ACLAND, M.A.).
BISHOP OF CHOTA NAGPUR (RIGHT REV. K. W. S. KENNEDY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF COLOMBO (RIGHT REV. M. R. CARPENTER-GARNIER, D.D.).
BISHOP OF DORNAKAL (RIGHT REV. V. S. AZARIAH, LL.D.).
BISHOP OF LUCKNOW (RIGHT REV. C. J. G. SAUNDERS, M.A.).
BISHOP OF MADRAS (RIGHT REV. E. H. M. WALLER, M.A.).
BISHOP OF NAGPUR (RIGHT REV. A. WOOD, D.D.).
BISHOP OF NASIK (RIGHT REV. P. H. LOYD, M.A.).
BISHOP OF RANGOON (RIGHT REV. N. H. TUBBS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF TINNEVELLY AND MADURA (RIGHT REV. F. J. WESTERN, M.A.).
BISHOP IN TRAVANCORE AND COCHIN (RIGHT REV. E. A. L. MOORE, M.A.).

---

BISHOP OF ATHABASCA (RIGHT REV. E. F. ROBINS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF BRANDON (RIGHT REV. W. W. H. THOMAS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF CALGARY (RIGHT REV. L. R. SHERMAN, M.A.).
BISHOP OF EDMONTON (RIGHT REV. H. A. GRAY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF KEEWATIN (RIGHT REV. A. D. A. DEWDNEY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF MACKENZIE RIVER (RIGHT REV. W. A. GEDDES, D.D.).
BISHOP OF MOOSONEE (RIGHT REV. J. G. ANDERSON, D.D.).
BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE (RIGHT REV. M. T. M. HARDING, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SASKATCHEWAN (RIGHT REV. G. E. LLOYD, D.D.).
BISHOP OF YUKON (RIGHT REV. I. O. STRINGER, D.D.).

Bishop of Fredericton (Right Rev. J. A. Richardson, D.D.).
Bishop of Montreal (Right Rev. J. C. Farthing, D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Nova Scotia (Right Rev. J. HacKenley, D.D.).
Bishop of Quebec (Right Rev. L. W. Williams, D.D.).

Archbishop of New Westminster *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. A. U. de Pencier, D.D.).
Bishop of British Columbia (Right Rev. C. de V. Schofield, D.D.).
Bishop of Caledonia (Right Rev. G. A. Rix, D.D.).
Bishop of Cariboo (Right Rev. W. R. Adams, D.D.).
Bishop of Kootenay (Right Rev. A. J. Doull, D.D.).
Bishop of Algoma (Right Rev. R. R. Smith, D.D.).
Bishop of Niagara (Right Rev. D. T. Owen, D.D.).
Bishop of Ontario (Right Rev. C. A. Seager, D.D.).
Bishop of Ottawa (Right Rev. J. C. Roper, D.D.).
Bishop of Toronto (Right Rev. J. F. Sweeny, D.D.).

Archbishop of Sydney *Primate and Metropolitan* (Most Rev. J. C. Wright, D.D.).
Bishop of Armidale (Right Rev. J. S. Moyes, M.A.).
Bishop of Bathurst (Right Rev. H. Crotty, D.D.).
  Coadjutor Bishop of Bathurst (Right Rev. A. L. Wylde, M.A.).
Bishop of Goulburn (Right Rev. L. B. Radford, D.D.).
Bishop of Grafton (Right Rev. J. W. Ashton, D.D.).
† Bishop of Newcastle (Right Rev. G. M. Long, D.D.).
Bishop of Riverina (Right Rev. R. C. Halse, M.A.).

Archbishop of Melbourne, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. F. W. Head, D.D.).
Bishop of Ballarat (Right Rev. P. C. T. Crick, D.D.).
Bishop of Bendigo (Right Rev. D. Baker, M.A.).
Bishop of Gippsland (Right Rev. G. H. Cranswick, D.D.).
Bishop of St. Arnaud (Right Rev. M. C. James, D.D.).
Bishop of Wangaratta (Right Rev. J. S. Hart, M.A.).

Archbishop of Brisbane, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. G. Sharp, D.D.).
Bishop of Carpentaria (Right Rev. S. H. Davies, B.A.).
Bishop of New Guinea (Right Rev. H. Newton, D.D.).
Bishop of North Queensland (Right Rev. J. O. Feetham, D.D.).
Bishop of Rockhampton (Right Rev. F. L. Ash, B.A.).

---

† Died July 9, 1930.

Archbishop of Perth, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. H. F. Le Fanu, M.A.).
Bishop of Kalgoorlie (Right Rev. W. E. Elsey, D.D.).
Bishop of North-west Australia (Right Rev. J. Frewer).

---

Bishop of Tasmania (Right Rev. R. S. Hay, D.D.).
Bishop of Willochra (Right Rev. R. Thomas, D.D.).

---

Archbishop of Capetown, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. W. M. Carter D.D.).
Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown (Right Rev. J. O. Nash, D.D.).
Bishop of Bloemfontein (Right Rev. W. J. Carey, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. S. J. Haynes).
Bishop of Damaraland (Right Rev. N. W. Fogarty, D.D.).
Bishop of George (Right Rev. H. B. Sidwell, D.D.).
Bishop of Grahamstown (Right Rev. F. R. Phelps, D.D.).
Bishop of Johannesburg (Right Rev. A. B. L. Karney, D.D.).
Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman (Right Rev. T. S. Gibson, M.A.).
Bishop of Lebombo (Right Rev. B. W. Peacey, M.A.).
Bishop of Natal (Right Rev. L. N. Fisher, D.D.).
Bishop of Pretoria (Right Rev. N. S. Talbot, D.D.).
Bishop of S. John's, Kaffraria (Right Rev. E. H. Etheridge, D.D.).
Bishop of Southern Rhodesia (Right Rev. E. F. Paget, M.A.).
Bishop of Zululand (Right Rev. C. A. W. Aylen, M.A.).

---

Archbishop of New Zealand, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. A. W. Averill, D.D.).
Bishop of Christchurch (Right Rev. C. W. West-Watson, D.D.).
Bishop of Melanesia (Right Rev. F. M. Molyneux, M.A.).
Bishop of Nelson (Right Rev. W. C. Sadlier, D.D.).
Bishop in Polynesia (Right Rev. L. S. Kempthorne, M.A.).
Bishop of Waikato (Right Rev. C. A. Cherrington, B.D.).

---

Archbishop of the West Indies and Bishop of Antigua, *Metropolitan* (Most Rev. E. Hutson, D.D.).
Bishop of Barbados (Right Rev. D. W. Bentley, D.D.).
Bishop of British Honduras (Right Rev. E. A. Dunn, D.D.).
Bishop of Guiana (Right Rev. O. H. Parry, M.A.).
Bishop of Jamaica (Right Rev. G. F. C. de Carteret, D.D.).
Assistant Bishop (Right Rev. W. G. Hardie, M.A.).
Bishop of Nassau (Right Rev. R. G. Shedden, D.D.).
Bishop of Trinidad (Right Rev. A. H. Anstey, D.D.).
Bishop of the Windward Islands (Right Rev. A. P. Berkeley, D.D.).

---

Bishop in North Tokyo *Chairman of the House of Bishops* (Right Rev. J. McKim, D.D.).
Bishop in Mid-Japan (Right Rev. H. J. Hamilton, D.D.).

BISHOP IN HOKKAIDO (RIGHT REV. G. J. WALSH, D.D.).
BISHOP IN KOBE (RIGHT REV. J. B. SIMPSON, D.D.).
BISHOP IN SOUTH JAPAN (RIGHT REV. A. LEA, D.D.).
BISHOP IN SOUTH TOKYO (RIGHT REV. S. HEASLETT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF TOKYO (RIGHT REV. P. Y. MATSUI, D.D.).

---

BISHOP OF HANKOW (*Chairman of the House of Bishops*) (RIGHT REV. L. H. ROOTS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF CHEKIANG (RIGHT REV. J. CURTIS, B.D.).
BISHOP IN FUKIEN (RIGHT REV. J. HIND, D.D.).
BISHOP IN KWANGSI-HUNAN (RIGHT REV. J. HOLDEN, D.D.).
BISHOP IN NORTH CHINA (RIGHT REV. F. L. NORRIS, D.D.).
BISHOP IN SHANTUNG (RIGHT REV. T. A. SCOTT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF VICTORIA, HONG KONG (RIGHT REV. C. R. DUPPUY, D.D.).
BISHOP IN WESTERN CHINA (RIGHT REV. H. W. K. MOWLL, D.D.).
ASSISTANT BISHOP IN HONAN (RIGHT REV. P. LINDEL TSEN, S.T.D.).

---

BISHOP OF ACCRA (RIGHT REV. J. O. AGLIONBY, D.D.).
BISHOP IN ARGENTINA (RIGHT REV. E. F. EVERY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF BERMUDA (RIGHT REV. A. HEBER BROWNE, D.D.).
BISHOP OF CENTRAL TANGANYIKA (RIGHT REV. G. A. CHAMBERS, D.D.).
BISHOP IN COREA (RIGHT REV. M. N. TROLLOPE, D.D.).
    ASSISTANT BISHOP IN COREA (RIGHT REV. H. J. EMBLING, M.A.).
BISHOP IN EGYPT AND THE SUDAN (Right Rev. LL. H. GWYNNE, D.D.).
BISHOP OF FALKLAND ISLANDS (RIGHT REV. N. S. DE JERSEY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR (RIGHT REV. F. C. N. HICKS, D.D.).
BISHOP IN JERUSALEM (RIGHT REV. R. MACINNES, D.D.).
BISHOP OF LABUAN AND SARAWAK (RIGHT REV. E. D. L. DANSON, D.D.).
BISHOP OF LAGOS (RIGHT REV. F. M. JONES, D.D.).
    ASSISTANT BISHOP OF LAGOS (RIGHT REV. A. W. SMITH, M.A.).
BISHOP IN MADAGASCAR (RIGHT REV. R. S. M. O'FERRALL, D.D.).
BISHOP OF MASASI (RIGHT REV. W. V. LUCAS, M.A.).
BISHOP OF MAURITIUS (RIGHT REV. C. H. GOLDING-BIRD, D.D.).
BISHOP OF MOMBASA (RIGHT REV. R. S. HEYWOOD, D.D.).
BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND (RIGHT REV. W. C. WHITE, D.D.).
BISHOP ON THE NIGER (RIGHT REV. B. LASBREY, D.D.).
    ASSISTANT BISHOP ON THE NIGER (RIGHT REV. A. W. HOWELLS, D.D.).
BISHOP OF NORTHERN RHODESIA (RIGHT REV. A. J. W. MAY, D.D.).
BISHOP OF NYASALAND (RIGHT REV. G. W. DOUGLAS, M.A.).
BISHOP IN PERSIA (RIGHT REV. J. H. LINTON, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE (RIGHT REV. G. W. WRIGHT, D.D.).
BISHOP OF SINGAPORE (RIGHT REV. B. C. ROBERTS, M.A.).
BISHOP OF UGANDA (RIGHT REV. J. J. WILLIS, D.D.).
BISHOP ON THE UPPER NILE (RIGHT REV. A. L. KITCHING, M.A.).
BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR (RIGHT REV. T. H. BIRLEY, D.D.).

# ENCYCLICAL LETTER

## *NOTE.*

*If it is desired to read this Encyclical Letter in the public services of the Church, it may be found convenient to divide it into portions. For this purpose appropriate divisions might occur at p.* 25 *and p.* 30.

# ENCYCLICAL LETTER

## TO THE FAITHFUL IN CHRIST JESUS

WE, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, three hundred and seven in number, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year of Our Lord 1930, give you greeting in the Name of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We who write are bearers of the sacred commission of the Ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church. In His Name we desire to set forth before you the outcome of the grave deliberations to which, after solemn prayer and Eucharist, we have for five weeks devoted ourselves day by day. We take this opportunity of thanking from our hearts all those, both far and near, who have prayed God to give us His Spirit's present aid. We hope that the results of our work may bring encouragement and help to this great circle of intercessors, even in remote parts of the earth. Our deliberations were preceded by careful inquiry upon many sides into the matters about which we speak. In this Letter we propose to give a connected view of these matters, in the hope that it will make our Resolutions more intelligible, and lead many to study them, together with the Reports of our Committees on which they are based.

The Bishops who were present at the last Lambeth Conference ten years ago found that one idea ran through all their work and bound it together in a true unity. It was the idea of *fellowship*. In like manner we have discovered one idea underlying all our long deliberations: it is the idea of *witness*. These two ideas are closely related. On the one hand, the purpose of every true human fellowship is to bear witness to certain great principles—the principles of truth, goodness and love, which express and fulfil the kingdom of God: among these fellowships the Church is called to bear witness to the supreme revelation of God—of His nature, His will, His kingdom—which has been given to the world in Jesus Christ our Lord. On the other hand, witness, if it is to be made effective among men, must be borne by a body, a fellowship. So we learn in every branch of human endeavour. And it would be a true description of the Church of Christ to say that it is a fellowship of witness. Our Lord Himself in His last recorded words laid this charge upon it, " Ye shall be witnesses unto Me . . . . . unto the uttermost parts of the earth." There comes into our mind the vision of the great succession of those who have borne this witness in past generations. They encompass, like a radiant cloud, each new generation, as it takes up the age-long testimony. They add their voices to ours, as we now specially and solemnly summon every member of the Church of our day to the fulfilment of Christ's parting charge. Here we find another link with the last Conference, for the long list of its Resolutions ended with the words, " if Christian witness is to be fully effective, it must be borne by nothing short of the whole body of Christian people."

## THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

Our appeal in this Letter begins, as the series of our Reports begins, with a *Sursum Corda.* The primary witness which the Church is called to give is the witness of its faith in God, and we would have men everywhere lift their minds and hearts with new confidence and expectancy to Him as ultimate Reality, to God in his Majesty as Creator, to God in His even greater Majesty as Redeemer.

We are aware of the extent to which the very thought of God seems to be passing away from the minds and hearts of many even in nominally Christian nations. The ten years since we last met have seen the development of one vast political and social experiment which is, at least professedly, rooted in the denial of God's existence. Even where God is still acknowledged, He is often regarded as too elusive or remote to be relevant to the practical concerns of life. And it is not surprising that where belief in God has weakened, the sense of sin has in large measure disappeared, morality has shown signs of degenerating into little more than a recognition of the value of kindness, and the supreme good has almost come to be thought of in terms of comfort and excitement.

But more significant is the increasing consciousness of thoughtful men and women that the emancipations which they have lately won do not yield deep or lasting satisfactions ; that selfishness is self-defeating ; that the heart of modern life, with all its exuberance of interest, is disquietingly void of conviction, and that once again experience proves personal happiness to be, in fact and not merely in pious word, linked with spiritual ideals and with moral standards and endeavours.

Many, too, of those who at present sit loose to the faith and practice of the Church are not opposed on conviction to the claim of Christianity; they are not thinking about it: they have not revolted against the Gospel, but against a presentation of the Gospel which falls far short of its true range and splendour.

Perhaps most noteworthy of all, there is much in the scientific and philosophical thinking of our time which provides a climate more favourable to faith in God than has existed for generations. New interpretations of the cosmic process are now before us which are congruous with Christian Theism. The great scientific movement of the nineteenth century had the appearance, at least, of hostility to religion. But now, from within that movement and under its impulse, views of the universal process are being formed which point to a spiritual interpretation. We are now able, by the help of the various departmental sciences, to trace in outline a continuous process of creative development in which at every stage we can find the Divine presence and power. Thus scientific thinking and discovery seem to be giving us back the sense of reverence and awe before the sublimity of a Creator Who is, not only the cause and ground of the universe, but always and everywhere active within it.

Christianity more than any other of the great religions has undergone the discipline of contact with scientific methods of thought, and emerges therefrom still strong to redeem and to inspire.

It is in view of such facts and circumstances that we declare our belief that the Church is at this time being called to fresh effort to proclaim to all men, at once more thoughtfully and more ardently, the Gospel of God with which it has been entrusted.

We know but too well that the root of our failure to behold God, and to manifest Him to the world, is sin; that what we have to deal with is primarily not imperfect thinking but evil wills. Yet, if our proclamation of the gospel of God is to have its proper appeal to the world of to-day, we must see to it that we ourselves are thinking about Him as persistently, as largely, and as worthily as we can.

We must school ourselves to include in our habits of thought about the Creator God as much as we can of the beauty and order of the world, and of everything in life that evokes the awe, the loyalty and the self-sacrifice of men and women at their best.

We must recover also our vision of the uniqueness of the work of God in the hearts of His people—the true subject of the Old Testament—which culminates in the coming of our Lord Himself and in the appearance of His Church among men. In Him as nowhere else, in Him alone, God's character, God's gracious love and innermost purpose are revealed. Through Him and through His Church there are brought inside every department of human effort and life a new spirit, a new motive, new resources of vision and faith, of hope and courage.

Thus through the Incarnation and by his Holy Spirit in the Church God is ever moving forth to conserve and to perfect all that He has achieved, and still strives to achieve, in hearts wherein Christ is not yet enthroned. Civilization, in so far as it is good, is ultimately of God's giving, no less than is His grace in Christ. Never must our thought of God be inconsistent with all that we may learn of His character in Christ. Never must our thought of God be so cramped that we represent Him as less than the Lord of all good life.

If, however, our vision of God's glory is thus to be renewed, it will involve for most of us, clergy and laity alike, a new readiness to read and ponder afresh, with some of the many aids which modern research gives us, the Bible and in particular the New Testament. It will also involve a new readiness to acquaint ourselves, according to our capacity, with some of the best thinking of our time about the meaning of life, and to identify ourselves, as best we may, in thought and conduct, with some of life's more serious endeavours. Not many are called to be students, but all can do something to learn and to think more intelligently about the religion which they profess and about its bearing on life around them.

But we must not only do what we can, to read and think. We must pursue—some of us, perhaps, as a new act of faith in God, and all of us with new devotion and diligence—the practice of personal prayer and strive to grow in the ability to pray. Not only will more serious thinking about our holy religion and about life thus quicken our prayers, but prayer can and will quicken our thought of and faith in God.

Further, we recall our Church people and all who own the name of Christ to the privilege and duty which are theirs of expressing their faith and receiving pardon and renewal through joining with the brethren regularly in the public worship of the Church and especially in the Blessed Sacrament of the Holy Communion. The Church's chief duty is to love and worship God; and in that love and worship it gives its chief witness to the world. They should reflect what wrong they do to God, to others and to themselves if they grow slack in fulfilling, especially on Sunday, this their clear and obvious duty. We whose privilege it is to lead others in worship are bound to make that worship as worthy as we can of Him to Whom it is offered, worthy in its spirit and its tone, worthy also in its range and scope, taking, as we ought, every opportunity that is ours of bringing all human concerns and interests within its ambit of praise and intercession.

Worship unites us in a fellowship of adoration; and, when it is worthily offered, can become for us all a joy as well as a duty, and bring us that refreshment and encouragement for which thousands are really hungry, though they know not for what they hunger.

*Sursum Corda*, Lift up your hearts—such a call from God as we have ourselves thus heard is not easily expressed, least of all in such a Letter as this. Yet it was to this high theme that we in the Lambeth Conference were moved to direct our thoughts; and we commend to thoughtful people the Report of our first Committee.

## THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

### *Marriage and Sex*

If the Church is Christ's Body, it is the organ through which His Spirit now finds expression in the world. He did not commit His gospel to writings but to a society which should alike interpret and exemplify His scheme of life. From the first this community-witness distinguished the Church from all the clubs and brotherhoods which abounded in the world of that day. Its purity, its comradeship, its cheerfulness were its attractive force. It provided a new scheme of life, and it grew. Its very growth in size and in popularity became its danger. So it is still. What many churchpeople need to recognise is that Christ's community has been commissioned to set a standard of life which is not that of the world. Too often has the standard of Christians been assimilated to that of the surrounding society or of the spirit of the age. But the tremendous commission of the Head of the Church confronts us. "Ye are the salt of the earth." "Ye are the light of the world." No metaphors could be more searching. Salt and light, He says, and that in every place and relationship of life—first and foremost, in all that concerns the family.

The beauty of family life is one of God's most precious gifts, and its preservation is a paramount responsibility of the Church.

Its foundation is the life-long union of husband and wife on which our Lord decisively set His seal. "One flesh," He said they were to be. Holy marriage is part of God's plan for mankind. It follows that any community disregards this at its peril. Empires have perished before now because the dry rot of laxity and corruption in home life set in. To maintain the ideal of marriage is therefore to preserve the social health of the community. It is a national interest of supreme value. It follows that divorce is unnatural. It destroys the security of the union and the stability of the family. If there are children, they are deprived of the guardianship to which God called both their parents. To the defence of Christ's standard of marriage we summon the members of the Church, for on it depend all that makes the magic of the word, home.

Indeed we must lift the whole subject of sex into a pure and clear atmosphere. God would have us think of sex as of something sacred. Many influences in our day tend to concentrate attention on sex and not always upon its sacredness. Among the tasks that confront the Church to-day none is more noble or more urgent than that of rescuing the whole subject from degradation in thought and conversation. We must set it in the light of the eternal issues of right and wrong, and reveal the noble origin of sex in the creative activity of a Father who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. We believe that the way to do this can be summed up in one word: education. Here the duty of parents is plain, and its fulfilment is part of that witness to truth and purity which members of the Church are bound to bear and not least to their own children. If the children have learnt from the first to connect sex instincts with the beauty and goodness of God, they will not only themselves be proof against some of the worst evils of our age, but will also become diffusers of that moral atmosphere where purity lives and all that is impure must die. We think that this duty of education needs far more careful attention than it has received. Rightly we set before our people Christ's standard of marriage; but we have done all too little to prepare them for it. It is admitted that no one should approach Confirmation or Holy Communion without careful and prolonged preparation. And Marriage is sacramental. It is, as St. Paul said, a great mystery. It is not only sacramental in its nature, it is a vocation for life. Therefore careful preparation is needed for it.

Bound up with that high and holy vocation is the vocation to parenthood. Here we would sound a call to all who will listen. Every child is for the State a potential citizen, for the

Church a potential saint. When healthy parents refuse for selfish reasons to have children in homes where there is, or by self-denial may be, provision for them, they deny to both Church and nation lives, which, with a Christian training, might be of priceless value to the community. We are familiar with the difficulties. We deeply sympathise with those who have burdens which are hard to bear. But we appeal to the whole community of the Church to remember that in home life, as in personal life, we are called to take up the cross, to endure hardness, and to count upon the enabling power of the Spirit of God. And indeed when the sacrifice is made for the sake of the family, that cross becomes a crown.

### *Race*

We have spoken of the family. But every family is a reflection of that great human family of which God is Father, and of which the nations and races are the members. We who address you are ourselves representatives of that great family. For among the bishops here assembled there are representatives not only of the western races but of the races of Japan, of China, of India, and of Africa. We have found our brotherhood in Christ, and we are sure that only in His world-wide community can that brotherhood be securely established. No vague humanitarianism is enough. When men of different races and nations can say "Our Father," believing in God who was made visible in Jesus Christ, then a unity begins to be felt which transcends the differences of colour and tradition.

We must confess that as Christians we have only imperfectly realised this family life. There still survives among Christians the peculiar form of pride known as race superiority. Anglo-Saxons, perhaps, are specially liable to this infection. But it is one that must needs be cast out in a day when races and nations are coming to a self-consciousness, which, though sometimes exaggerated, calls for understanding and sympathy. Questions of exceeding difficulty, both in politics and industry, are waiting for an answer. Everything depends, humanly speaking, on the spirit in which they are approached. We confess that in many parts of the Church men have been blind to what is implied in the all-embracing manhood of the Son of God, and to the full meaning of life in the Body of Christ, the Body in which there can be neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor barbarian, bondman nor freeman, but Christ is all and in all. In that divine community we can afford to recognise differences fully and frankly, just because in Christ there is that which transcends them. Into that community every nation can bring its traditions, gifts, experiences, characteristics, knowing that they will be welcomed as treasures contributed by the members of the family to be tested and used for the welfare of the whole. The issue is vital for the future of the world. To fail here would be to leave the door open to racial and national animosities, the outcome of which it is awful to contemplate. Here again the witness of the Church must be given. This may mean a drastic revision of thought and action on the part of many of its members. It certainly means a humble response to the leadership of the Spirit. It is a real test of our own membership. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

### *Peace and War*

As we witness to the truth that "God has made of one blood all nations of men," so also we must witness to God's will for peace among the nations. We thank Him for the achievements of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact which condemns war as a means for settling international disputes. If these movements towards peace are to be effective and permanent, there is need of a new strength of conviction, clearness of purpose, and courage in action among the peoples of the world. Here the Church should take the lead. For the Christian must condemn war not merely because it is wasteful and ruinous, a cause of untold misery, but far more because it is contrary to the will of God.

Peace is indeed something greater than a mere refusal to fight. Peace within the nation and among the nations depends on truth and justice. There cannot be peace unless we are trying to obey our Lord's command, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." As citizens of that kingdom we are summoned to make war on injustice, falsehood and covetousness within ourselves and in the world around us. Evil social conditions—such as slums or unemployment—are causes of unrest because they are outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual wrong. We dare not acquiesce in them, for the remedy lies not only in the best means that economic science can devise, but also in the active witness and willing self-sacrifice of Christian people. Indeed we cannot be true witnesses to God's kingdom of peace, if we allow self-interest to be the ruling principle of any sphere of life. Neither industry nor commerce nor finance lie outside the borders of the kingdom of God, for at every point they touch human values and depend on human motives, and nothing human is alien to Him Who came that men might have life and have it abundantly. Only when we witness always and everywhere to His principles and rely upon His power, can we obtain from Him those gifts of truth and righteousness and love, of which peace is the perfect fruit.

## THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

We pass to the subject of the Unity of the Church which was assigned to our third Committee.

Our Lord Himself prayed that those who should believe on Him might be one that the world might believe that His Father had sent Him. The witness which He wishes us to bear to Him before the world is our unity in Him. A world torn with divisions is pathetically ready to acclaim our unity, when it comes into sight, as an evidence of the power of God.

In the Conference of 1920 we felt the constraint of a great impulse which we believed to be of Divine origin, and under its influence we sent out the Appeal to all Christian people. In this Conference we have something even greater to chronicle, definite actions tending to unions of Churches, in which some of our Churches are closely concerned. If holy aspirations are great, God-guided actions are greater.

Many movements towards unity have taken place in the last ten years. These we cannot here describe. Particulars of them will be found in the Report of our committee. We will write specially of two movements because they are now approaching the phase of definite action.

The first of these concerns some of the oldest Churches in Christendom. A most important delegation from the Orthodox Churches of the East arranged by the Œcumenical Patriarch and headed by the Patriarch of Alexandria visited our Conference. Another delegation headed by the Archbishop of Utrecht represented the Old Catholics. Both of these delegations came to tell us that they desired definite and practical steps to be taken for the restoration of communion between their Churches and ours. This is a notable advance crowning a long period of increasing friendliness. The Conference has asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint Commissions of theologians to confer with similar Commissions, if appointed by the authorities of the Orthodox and of the Old Catholics, and it is hoped that these Commissions may find such a unity in faith and such a similarity in practice to exist between the Churches, that restoration of communion may become possible as soon as the appropriate assemblies of the various Churches can meet.

In the second place we must refer at greater length to the scheme for a union of Churches in South India, which had been begun a year before the last Lambeth Conference, and has now reached an advanced stage. Our brethren of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, who will have the responsibility for carrying it through, if it is to be consummated, have reported the scheme in its present state to the Conference and asked for our advice. Our committee has tendered advice on many points in its Report, to which the Conference has given its general approval. This scheme is for a union in South India between the members of our Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and the South India United Church, so called because it unites the converts of certain Presbyterian and Congregationalist Missions. The general conception of the scheme is that these different elements will come together in one body, possessing the traditional framework of faith and order which characterised the whole Church for so many centuries. Within this one body the constant intercourse of the different members will, it is hoped, gradually bring about a unity, in which all those things that are of God in their several traditions will be not only preserved but enriched by happy combination. This process cannot be initiated without sacrifices, and must in its early stages involve anomalies and irregularities—a prospect which gives rise to serious misgivings in many minds. But these misgivings are outweighed by hope and by our trust in God's will to perfect His work of reconciliation.

We rejoice that one part of the Anglican Communion should be found ready to make this venture for a corporate union with certain non-episcopal Churches. We feel that in a sense our brethren in South India are making this experiment on behalf of the whole body of the Anglican Churches. They are our pioneers in this direction of the movement for unity. The whole Communion will surely stand by them with earnest prayer and generous loyalty. But we are well aware that the constituency which we represent is not universally convinced about all the provisions of the Scheme, and wishes to see how it works out, before committing itself to definite approval. To meet this situation we have recommended to the Churches concerned certain arrangements which we desire to explain to our people in the clearest terms.

The Anglican Communion is a group of Churches bound together by very close ties of history and tradition, doctrine and practice. After the union in South India, Anglicans who will be included in the united Church will not give up the use of the Prayer Book or discard any of the doctrines held in the Anglican Churches. Yet the united Church in South India will not itself be an Anglican Church : it will be a distinct Province of the Universal Church. It will have a very real intercommunion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, though for a time that intercommunion will be limited in certain directions by their rules. Its Bishops will be received as Bishops by these Churches. Its episcopally ordained ministers—a continually increasing number—will be entitled under the usual rules to administer the Communion in the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Its communicants will be entitled to communicate with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, except in cases forbidden by the rules of these Churches. On the other hand no right to minister in the Churches of that Communion will be acquired by those ministers who have not been episcopally ordained.

The fact that the Church in South India will not be a member of the group of Churches called the Anglican Communion will inevitably impose on our brethren a temporary severance of close and treasured relationships, in council and synod, with their brethren in North India. But these are sacrifices which we believe they will make cheerfully in the hope of achieving a union between episcopal and non-episcopal churches such as has never yet been effected, and of building up a real and living Church in India. For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned nor deserted by the Anglican Communion. It will preserve for them unimpaired their welcome to its love and fellowship, to its altars and its pulpits. For it will be looking forward to the day when their work will be rewarded and the unity of these Churches, not only in South India but in the whole of India, will be completed, and there will emerge a Province of Christ's Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all truth, within whose visible unity treasures of faith and order, nowhere in the Church at present combined, will be possessed in common, and the power of Christ will be manifest in a new richness.

It was with unanimity and with profound sense of thankfulness that the Conference adopted the Resolutions relating to South India.

We have given prominence to these two groups of negotiations because they contemplate action in the near future. Though in other directions, and especially in our relations with the non-Episcopal Churches of our various countries, no such measurable advance can be recorded, we feel that the aspirations of the last Lambeth Conference have not failed, but are standing the strain of the attempt to translate words into action. In addition to delegations from Episcopal Churches other than those which we have mentioned, our Committee had the privilege of receiving and conferring with distinguished representatives of the now happily united Church of Scotland and of the Evangelical Free Churches of England. It was with renewed hope of progress that the Conference decided to invite these non-Episcopal Churches to enter into full conference with us once more. Further, it adopted unanimously a resolution in favour of " efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communions," believing that, while the leaders discuss the still unsolved problems of Church order, the rank and file may be brought to closer mutual understanding through united public witness to those truths of our faith which we rejoice to know we hold in common. May God reinforce the impulse which He gave ten years ago with courage, wisdom and love to pursue the quest of the visible unity of the whole Church of Christ.

## THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

We turn next to the subject of the Anglican Communion, with which our fourth Committee was occupied. This subject is very closely connected with the last. For it is our duty to envisage the one Church of Christ as it will be when reunited, and to shape the Churches of our own Communion so that they will, even now, conform as much as possible to that ideal, and be ready to take their place within it, when it is realised.

Such a direction of our thoughts is almost forced upon us by certain changes which are even now observable in the Anglican Communion. This Communion is a commonwealth of Churches without a central constitution: it is a federation without a federal government. It has come into existence without any deliberate policy, by the extension of the Churches of Great Britain and Ireland beyond the limits of these Islands. The extension has been of a double nature, and the Churches overseas bear its impress. Some of them are, primarily, Churches of the British people scattered throughout the world; others are, primarily, Churches of other peoples, planted by our Missions. Hitherto, they have all been Anglican, in the sense that they reflect the leading characteristics of the Church of England. They teach—as she does—the Catholic Faith in its entirety and in the proportions in which it is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. They refuse—as she does—to accept any statement, or practice, as of authority, which is not consistent with the Holy Scriptures and the understanding and practice of our religion as exhibited in the undivided Church. They are, in the idiom of our fathers, " particular or national " Churches, and they repudiate any idea of a central authority, other than Councils of Bishops. They combine respect for antiquity with freedom in the pursuit of truth. They are both Catholic and Evangelical. This is still to-day a true description of the facts and ideals of the Anglican Communion.

But these very ideals are working a change. Every Church of our Communion is endeavouring to do for the country where it exists the service which the Church of England has done for England—to represent the Christian religion and the Catholic Faith in a manner congenial to the people of the land, and to give scope to their genius in the development of Christian life and worship. As the Churches founded by our Missions in India, China, Japan or Africa, more and more fully achieve this purpose, they may, in many ways, grow less and less like to each other and to their Mother, and, in consequence, less and less Anglican, though no less true to Catholic faith and order.

At the same time as we anticipate this progressive diversity within the unity of the Anglican Churches, we have before us a prospect of the restoration of communion with Churches which are, in no sense, Anglican. Our negotiations with the Orthodox Church and the Old Catholics illustrate this possibility in one direction, and the creation of united Churches—such as that proposed in India—illustrates it in another.

Thus beyond, but including, the federation of strictly Anglican Churches—which is now called the Anglican Communion—there may grow up a larger federation of much less homogeneous Churches, which will be in some measure in communion with the See of Canterbury. This federation, however little centralised, would need some organ to express its unity. It is our belief that the Councils of the Bishops were in antiquity, and will be again, the appropriate organ, by which the unity of distant Churches can find expression without any derogation from their rightful autonomy. The Lambeth Conference with its strict adherence to purely advisory functions has been, perhaps, preparing our minds for participation in the Councils of a larger and more important community of Churches. Every extension of this circle of visible fellowship would increase the power of the Church to witness to its Lord by its unity.

These two sections of our work have dealt in different ways with unity *between* Churches. This is necessary, if the Church is to bear the witness which its Lord requires. We must now draw attention to the equally urgent necessity for unity *within* each Church. We appeal to all our brethren to remember that their right to a place in the Church of Christ lies in His call to each of them, in His love that embraces them, and in His Spirit that dwells in them, far more than in the opinions which they profess or the methods which they pursue. It may even be necessary to the Church that men in it should hold and expound different opinions, in order that the Church as a whole should have the whole of truth, even as the rays of many colours which the spectrum shows combine to make the light of the sun. Let us all listen to His voice Who still has to say to His disciples, after all these centuries, " Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another."

## THE MINISTRY

In the witness and the work of the Church as of every other community there is need of leadership. Our Lord Himself shows us the crucial importance of providing leaders by the care and patience with which He trained the twelve whom He chose out from the general company of His disciples " that they might be with Him and that He might send them forth." This ministry has been perpetuated from the first days until now. The need of the leadership which it gives is undiminished. The honour of that leadership still remains.

We speak with knowledge gained in all parts of the world. We know that everywhere fields are white for the harvest. The Lord of the harvest calls for labourers that the harvest may be won. We who as Bishops of His Church have some title to speak in His Name, make now a strong appeal to young men, who accept Him as their Lord, to cherish the ambition of offering themselves in the Sacred Ministry for the highest service to which human life can be dedicated.

They will be ready to submit their ambition to the judgment of the responsible authorities of the Church. If it seems right that they should be prepared for ordination to the ministry and they are unable with the means at their disposal to meet the cost of a training, demanded alike by the rising standards of education and by the honour of their service, we call upon the Church in all lands to regard it as a duty and privilege to provide that training for them.

The leadership of women is needed as well as the leadership of men. We have sought in our Resolutions to encourage in every way open to us the ministry of women. They have become free as never before in history to use in varied service to the community their distinctive gifts and ideals. We know that many of them desire to devote their lives to Him in Whose service is the perfect freedom. We would assure them of our determination to secure for them, so far as in us lies, a place of honour in the organised life of the Church. To this end we have reviewed and enlarged the work entrusted to the Order of Deaconesses. We believe that in that Order women of ability will find increasing scope for powers of leadership and witness. And we call upon clergy and people alike to welcome and to use to the full the ministry of women not only in the pastoral work of the Church but in its teaching and worship.

We rejoice in the growth of religious communities within our own Communion as a sign of spiritual vitality, and as a source of spiritual strength to the whole body of the Church.

Neither to men nor to women does the ministry of Christ's Church offer a career of ease or affluence. Who would wish that it should ? The labourer indeed is worthy of his hire, and the Church's honour requires that the remuneration of its ministers should not be such as to cramp and hinder the efficiency of their work. That work is hard. It calls for the best that is in us—courage, humility, patience, loyalty, love. What work is there that makes a profounder difference in the lives of those whom it reaches ? What work is more worth doing ?

## YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION

We have been speaking, in this letter, of the Witness of the Church—what it is and what it might be. We have something to say, last of all, about the Church and the younger generation. And here we would affirm that it is for the Church to give its Christian witness in a way that will appeal to Youth and that Youth will understand. It is our confident belief that, when the Church does that, then Youth will make its own responsive witness in a fashion and on a scale far beyond that which any previous generation has seen.

For in the Church there has always been the spirit of Youth. Its Founder—the " Young Prince of Glory," in the phrase which Watts used in the first version of his familiar hymn—summoned a picked band of men to join His high adventure, and with youthful alacrity they responded. He—the Hero Christ—has always appealed to that in men which loves to do and dare and suffer for great causes, and to that appeal there never fails response from the young and from all who keep a heart of youth. We are sure that the younger people of to-day, despite certain powerful influences and tendencies in modern life, are at least as ready to respond to the good, when they see it, as any of their forefathers.

But our confidence that the heart of Youth is sound is by no means based on any optimistic disregard of factors in the life of our day which place serious obstacles in the path of those who wish to hold the Christian faith and to live the Christian life.

We cannot, and we would not, blind ourselves to the fact that a large number of the younger men and women of to-day (including many of the most high-minded) are alienated from the Church and from organised religion. The Report of our Committee asks why this is so, and makes some attempt at an answer. Here we will only say that we—leaders of the Church in many lands—are entirely ready to shoulder our full share of the blame for this state of affairs. If Church people were more like their Divine Master and showed more of His Spirit in life's common traffic, then these younger folk (who are naturally attracted to Christ Himself) would find themselves attracted also to the Society which bears His Name, and therein discover a power of His Spirit which otherwise they would never know.

What then may be done to break down the barriers which seem to stand between Youth and this Divine Society? There are just two points on which we wish to lay special emphasis. First, it is for us in the Church, who believe in and try to live according to the Gospel of the Incarnation, to humanize religion, if we would commend it to our generation. The estrangement between Youth and the Church arises partly from the fact that all the interests of life which to them are real and engrossing—science, art, music, literature, recreation, sport, friendship—seem to be quite other than the things in which the Church is interested. To them we appear to be largely preoccupied with dogmatic and ecclesiastical questions remote from common concerns. And so Religion often seems to remain in a back-water, while the main streams of life flow past it, untouched and unaffected. We have need to see ever more clearly the full significance of the truth that God became man, and to realise that the Religion of Jesus Christ, while essentially transcendent, mysterious, supernatural, is at the same time simple, human, with lowly things for its sacraments, and entirely relevant to the whole rich range of man's thought and activity.

Thus the witness of the Church to the truth about God must always be given in life and conduct. But secondly, such witness by life must be made more convincing, and its secret and power made intelligible and available, by the work of enlightened study and of effective teaching. With all the authority which may attach to this Conference we would urge upon Church people generally—and especially on those called to occupy any position of Christian leadership—the paramount duty of thinking out the meaning of the faith for themselves, and of making it, by every kind of educational resource, intelligible to the great multitude of younger folk within the Church or on its fringes, who are in a state of mental confusion, combined with spiritual hunger. There is abundant answer—and we should like to see it given more frequently and more thoroughly—to those who fear that they must either give up their attempt to keep in step with contemporary thought, or part with Religion. It is for us to show that wherever men genuinely seek after goodness and truth and beauty, God's Spirit is in that search and guides it towards Himself, Who is its inspiration and its goal.

One final word we would say direct to you younger folk, who, whether you take much or little part in Church life, are at least in sympathy with the ideals of Jesus Christ and want to make the world a better place. This Cause, to which we are all committed, demands everything that all, old or young, can give. Experience and adventurousness, judgment and enthusiasm, caution and courage, the sense of the value of tradition and faith in what is yet to come—let all be flung into the service of the common task. We are quite certain that, in all history, there has been no greater opportunity than there is to-day to claim Jesus Christ as Lord of all life and King throughout the world.

## CONCLUSION

As we close, we return to the main theme of our message. The Church of Christ, a fellowship of witness—this is the ideal we would put before all who may read or hear our words. We who send forth this Letter are men called by their office to be leaders of the Church in all parts of the world. But leadership is powerless without the willing loyalty and service of the whole body. There are times in the history of nations when some crisis quickens in the hearts of the people their sense of the honour and claim of citizenship. They make the cause of their country their own. In the service of their country, even to self-sacrifice, they become aware of their love of it. So, at this present time in the history of the Church of Christ, we are convinced that the pressure of material needs and comforts and pleasures and the spiritual perplexity and confusion which mark our generation can only be overcome, if all the members of the Church, moved by the Divine Spirit Who dwells within it, identify themselves with its mission and its witness. Through their service they will come to look upon it as the "beloved community." They will realise afresh the splendour of its calling. They will gain a new and joyful sense of the greatness of the gifts God has entrusted to it—the "good news" it proclaims, the faith tried and tested by the thought and experience of centuries, the presence of the living Christ assured to it even to the end of the days. We long to see the Divine Society moving among the societies of men with the light of the Gospel upon it and the strength of a corporate witness within it. It is to this corporate witness that we summon the people of our own Church throughout the world, humbly desiring that we with them may follow the example of our Master, Who said, "To this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the Truth."

Signed on behalf of the Conference,

COSMO CANTUAR:

GEORGE CICESTR: *Secretary*
MERVYN HAIGH, *Assistant Secretary*

*9th August*, 1930

## *NOTE*

It may be well to make clear the manner of our deliberations. The subjects proposed for consideration were first brought before us in Sessions of the whole Conference, lasting for six full days, from Monday, July 7th, to Saturday, July 12th. Having been there set forth in outline, they were then referred to large and carefully chosen Committees; and the Reports of these Committees, with the Resolutions which they had prepared, were subsequently laid before the Conference, meeting again to consider them in full session from Monday, July 28th, to Saturday, August 9th. By this procedure we have been able to secure both the detailed study which is the especial task of a Committee (a study greatly aided by the essays, Reports and papers which had been prepared for us), and that weight of judgment which belongs to the decisions of an assembly gathered from all parts of the world and bringing to the process of deliberation the manifold experience and knowledge acquired under widely different conditions in widely sundered fields of labour.

The judgment of the Conference is expressed in the Resolutions, 75 in number, appended to this Letter. These, and these alone, are affirmed by the Conference. The Reports, which are also printed herewith, have been received by the Conference; and the Conference has directed that they should be published; but the responsibility for the statements and opinions which they contain rests with the several Committees by whom they were prepared.

# RESOLUTIONS

# RESOLUTIONS
OF THE
# LAMBETH CONFERENCE
1930

## I. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

1. We believe that the Christian Church is the repository and trustee of a Revelation of God, given by Himself, which all members of the Church are bound to transmit to others, and that every member of the Church, both clerical and lay, is called to be a channel through which the Divine Life flows for the quickening of all mankind.

2. We believe that, in view of the enlarged knowledge gained in modern times of God's ordering of the world and the clearer apprehension of the creative process by which He prepared the way for the coming of Jesus Christ, there is urgent need in the face of many erroneous conceptions for a fresh presentation of the Christian doctrine of God; and we commend the Report of our Committee to the study of all thoughtful people in the hope that it may help towards meeting this need.

3. We affirm the supreme and unshaken authority of the Holy Scriptures as presenting the truth concerning God and the spiritual life in its historical setting and in its progressive revelation, both throughout the Old Testament and in the New. It is no part of the purpose of the Scriptures to give information on those themes which are the proper subject matter of scientific enquiry, nor is the Bible a collection of separate oracles, each containing a final declaration of truth. The doctrine of God is the centre of its teaching, set forth in its books "by divers portions and in divers manners." As Jesus Christ is the crown, so also is He the criterion of all revelation. We would impress upon Christian people the necessity of banishing from their minds ideas concerning the character of God which are inconsistent with the character of Jesus Christ. We believe that the work of our Lord Jesus Christ is continued by the Holy Spirit, Who not only interpreted Him to the Apostles, but has in every generation inspired and guided those who seek truth.

4. The Revelation of Christ was presented to the world under the forms of Jewish life and thought. It has found fuller expression, not without some admixture of misunderstanding, through the thought of Greece and Rome, and the sentiment of the Teutonic and Slavonic races. We anticipate that when this same revelation possesses their minds, the nations of Asia and Africa will still further enrich the Church of Christ by characteristic statements of the permanent Gospel, and by characteristic examples of Christian virtue and types of Christian worship.

We welcome such unfolding of the truth of the Gospel as one of the ways by which the nations may bring their riches into the service of Christ and His Church.

5. We recognise in the modern discoveries of science—whereby the boundaries of knowledge are extended, the needs of men are satisfied and their sufferings alleviated—veritable gifts of God, to be used with thankfulness to Him, and with that sense of responsibility which such thankfulness must create.

6. For the reasons set forth in Resolutions 2 and 3, there is need for the Church to renew and re-direct its teaching office :—

(*a*) By a fresh insistence upon the duty of thinking and learning as essential elements in the Christian life ;

(*b*) By recalling the clergy to a fuller sense of their duty in the exercise of the teaching office. Of all their functions this is one of the most important. It demands, especially in these days, prayer and study, both individual and corporate, on the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the manifestations of His Presence in the modern world ;

(*c*) By the provision of similar opportunities for the laity ;

(*d*) By a new emphasis upon the appeal to the mind as well as to the heart in the preaching of the Word as an element in Christian worship ; and

(*e*) By providing both for clergy and laity opportunities of Retreats and other well-tried methods for the deepening of the spiritual life through the growth of fellowship with God and man.

We especially desire to impress upon the younger clergy that the Church requires the service of men who will devote themselves to the study of theology in all its branches. The

Church needs learning, as well as spiritual power and practical ability, in its clergy.

7. We welcome an increased readiness in many educational authorities to accept the influence and assistance of the Church in its teaching capacity, and we urge that every effort should be made throughout the Church to seek such opportunities and to use them with sympathy and discretion.

As the intellectual meaning and content of the Christian doctrine of God cannot be fully apprehended without the aid of the highest human knowledge, it is essential that Christian theology should be studied and taught in Universities in contact with philosophy, science and criticism, and to that end that Faculties of Theology should be established in Universities wherever possible.

8. Believing as we do that men should offer their worship to God because of His great glory, and because of His supreme revelation of love in Jesus Christ, apart from any thought of benefits that may accrue to them, we urge upon the Church the absolute obligation of corporate worship. We believe that a fuller study of the Christian doctrine of God will both strengthen the sense of this obligation in the Church, and also help the Church to commend it to the world. Moreover we believe that it is through the development of their capacity for worship that men advance in their knowledge of God's nature, and may hope to penetrate further into His mysteries.

## II. THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

### *Marriage and Sex*

9. The Conference believes that the conditions of modern life call for a fresh statement from the Christian Church on the subject of sex. It declares that the functions of sex as a God-given factor in human life are essentially noble and creative. Responsibility in regard to their right use needs the greater emphasis in view of widespread laxity of thought and conduct in all these matters.

10. The Conference believes that in the exalted view of marriage taught by our Lord is to be found the solution of the problems with which we are faced. His teaching is reinforced by certain elements which have found a new emphasis in modern life, particularly the sacredness of personality, the more equal partnership of men and women, and the biological importance of monogamy.

11. The Conference believes that it is with this ideal in view that the Church must deal with questions of divorce and with whatever threatens the security of woman and the stability of the home. Mindful of our Lord's words, " What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," it reaffirms " as Our Lord's principle and standard of marriage, a life-long and indissoluble union, for better, for worse, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, and calls on all Christian people to maintain and bear witness to this standard."[1]

In cases of divorce—

(*a*) The Conference, while passing no judgment on the practice of regional or national Churches within our Communion, recommends that the marriage of one, whose former partner is still living, should not be celebrated according to the rites of the Church.

(*b*) Where an innocent person has remarried under civil sanction and desires to receive the Holy Communion, it recommends that the case should be referred for consideration to the Bishop, subject to provincial regulations.

(*c*) Finally, it would call attention to the Church's unceasing responsibility for the spiritual welfare of all her members who have come short of her standard in this as in any other respect, and to the fact that the Church's aim, individually and socially, is reconciliation to God and redemption from sin. It therefore urges all Bishops and clergy to keep this aim before them.

12. In all questions of marriage and sex the Conference emphasises the need of education. It is important that before the child's emotional re-action to sex is awakened, definite information should be given in an atmosphere of simplicity and beauty. The persons directly responsible for this are the

---

[1] Lambeth Conference, 1920. Resolution 67.

parents, who in the exercise of this responsibility will themselves need the best guidance that the Church can supply.

During childhood and youth the boy or the girl should thus be prepared for the responsibilities of adult life; but the Conference urges the need of some further preparation for those members of the Church who are about to marry.

To this end the Conference is convinced that steps ought to be taken (*a*) to secure a better education for the clergy in moral theology; (*b*) to establish, where they do not exist, in the various branches of the Anglican Communion central councils which would study the problems of sex from the Christian standpoint and give advice to the responsible authorities in diocese or parish or theological college as to methods of approach and lines of instruction; (*c*) to review the available literature and to take steps for its improvement and its circulation.

13. The Conference emphasises the truth that the sexual instinct is a holy thing implanted by God in human nature. It acknowledges that intercourse between husband and wife as the consummation of marriage has a value of its own within that sacrament, and that thereby married love is enhanced and its character strengthened. Further, seeing that the primary purpose for which marriage exists is the procreation of children, it believes that this purpose as well as the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control should be the governing considerations in that intercourse.

14. The Conference affirms (*a*) the duty of parenthood as the glory of married life; (*b*) the benefit of a family as a joy in itself, as a vital contribution to the nation's welfare, and as a means of character-building for both parents and children; (*c*) the privilege of discipline and sacrifice to this end.

15. Where there is a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, the method must be decided on Christian principles. The primary and obvious method is complete abstinence from intercourse (as far as may be necessary) in a life of discipline and self-control lived in the power of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless in those cases where there is such a clearly-felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, the Conference agrees that other methods may be used,

provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles. The Conference records its strong condemnation of the use of any methods of conception-control from motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience.

[*Carried by* 193 *votes to* 67.]

16. The Conference further records its abhorrence of the sinful practice of abortion.

17. While the Conference admits that economic conditions are a serious factor in the situation, it condemns the propaganda which treats conception-control as a way of meeting those unsatisfactory social and economic conditions which ought to be changed by the influence of Christian public opinion.

18. Sexual intercourse between persons who are not legally married is a grievous sin. The use of contraceptives does not remove the sin. In view of the widespread and increasing use of contraceptives among the unmarried and the extension of irregular unions owing to the diminution of any fear of consequences, the Conference presses for legislation forbidding the exposure for sale and the unrestricted advertisement of contraceptives, and placing definite restrictions upon their purchase.

19. Fear of consequences can never, for the Christian, be the ultimately effective motive for the maintenance of chastity before marriage. This can only be found in the love of God and reverence for His laws. The Conference emphasises the need of strong and wise teaching to make clear the Christian standpoint in this matter. That standpoint is that all illicit and irregular unions are wrong in that they offend against the true nature of love, they compromise the future happiness of married life, they are antagonistic to the welfare of the community, and, above all, they are contrary to the revealed will of God.

20. The Conference desires to express the debt which the Church owes to the devotion of those who in constantly changing conditions and in the face of increasing difficulties have maintained and carried forward the Preventive and Rescue work of the Church. Such devotion calls for greatly increased interest and support from all the members of the Church.

The removal of the causes which lead to the necessity for such work must first and foremost be sought in the creation of that healthier atmosphere and in the more thorough giving of sex instruction which are recommended in preceding resolutions. And this is recognised to the full by the leaders in the work. There is, however, at the present time urgent need for (*a*) much greater financial support, so that the workers may be adequately trained and adequately paid, (*b*) more regular interest on the part of Church people generally in them and in their work, (*c*) the help which the men of the Church can give in technical and legal matters, as also in personal service.

The Conference further desires in this connection to place on record its appreciation of the work done by Women Police in Great Britain, in the British Dominions and in the United States of America, and by those many social workers, in different parts of the world, who give themselves to the same difficult task.

### *Race*

21. The Conference affirms that the principle of trusteeship as laid down by Article XXII of the League of Nations Covenant cannot be duly applied in practice without full recognition of the fact that partnership must eventually follow as soon as two races can show an equal standard of civilisation. Accordingly, the Conference affirms that the ruling of one race by another can only be justified from the Christian standpoint when the highest welfare of the subject race is the constant aim of government, and when admission to an increasing share in the government of the country is an objective steadfastly pursued. To this end equal opportunity and impartial justice must be assured. Equal opportunity of development will result where the nation faithfully discharges its responsibility for the education of all its citizens, in which the co-operation of both the Church and the family with the State is essential; and Christian principles demand that equal justice be assured to every member of every community both from the Government and in the courts of law.

22. The Conference affirms its conviction that all communicants without distinction of race or colour should have access in any church to the Holy Table of the Lord, and that no one should be excluded from worship in any church on account of colour or race. Further, it urges that where, owing to diversity of language or custom, Christians of different races normally worship apart, special occasions should be sought for united services and corporate communion in order to witness to the unity of the Body of Christ.

The Conference would remind all Christian people that the ministrations of the clergy should never be rejected on grounds of colour or race, and in this connection it would state its opinion that in the interests of true unity it is undesirable that in any given area there should be two or more Bishops of the same Communion exercising independent jurisdiction.

23. The Conference affirms that the guiding principle of racial relations should be interdependence and not competition, though this interdependence does not of itself involve intermarriage; that the realisation in practice of human brotherhood postulates courtesy on the part of all races towards one another, co-operation in the study of racial relations and values, and a complete avoidance of any exploitation of the weaker races, such as is exemplified in the liquor traffic among the natives of Africa and enforced labour for private profit.

The Conference urges that the presence of Asiatic and African students at western universities affords an opportunity for promoting friendliness between different races, and asks that Christians should try to create such a public sentiment that these students may be received with sympathetic understanding and enabled to share in all that is best in western social life.

24. The Conference would insist that the maintenance of the Christian obligation on the part of men to respect and honour womanhood, involving the equally chivalrous treatment of the women of all races, is fundamental; and conversely, the Christian obligation on the part of women to maintain a high standard of morals and conduct, especially in their relations with men of a different colour, is equally fundamental.

## *Peace and War*

25. The Conference affirms that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

26. The Conference believes that peace will never be achieved till international relations are controlled by religious and ethical standards, and that the moral judgment of humanity needs to be enlisted on the side of peace. It therefore appeals to the religious leaders of all nations to give their support to the effort to promote those ideals of peace, brotherhood and justice for which the League of Nations stands.

The Conference welcomes the agreement made by leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples, in which they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another and agree that the settlement of all disputes which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means; and appeals to all Christian people to support this agreement to the utmost of their power and to help actively, by prayer and effort, agencies (such as the League of Nations Union and the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches) which are working to promote goodwill among the nations.

27. When nations have solemnly bound themselves by Treaty, Covenant or Pact for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the Conference holds that the Christian Church in every nation should refuse to countenance any war in regard to which the government of its own country has not declared its willingness to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration or conciliation.

28. The Conference believes that the existence of armaments on the present scale amongst the nations of the world endangers the maintenance of peace, and appeals for a determined effort to secure further reduction by international agreement.

29. Believing that peace within the nation and among the nations is bound up with the acceptance of Christian principles in the ordering of social and industrial life, the Conference re-affirms the Resolutions (73-80)[1] of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, which deal with that subject. While there is in many countries an increasing desire for justice and therefore a growing will to peace, the world is still faced with grave social and economic evils which are an offence to the Christian conscience, and a menace to peace. All these evils call for the best scientific treatment on international lines, and also for a practical application of the principle of united service and self-sacrifice on the part of all Christian people.

30. The Conference recognises with thankfulness the efforts made by the League of Nations to control the drug traffic, and calls upon all Christian people to pray and to labour, as

---

[1] See p. 107.

they have opportunity, that measures may soon be devised, both by national and international action, which will effectively limit the production, manufacture and sale of dangerous drugs, particularly opium, cocaine and their derivatives, to the amounts required for scientific and medical purposes.

## III. THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

31. The Conference records, with deep thanks to Almighty God, the signs of a growing movement towards Christian unity in all parts of the world since the issue of the Appeal to All Christian People by the Lambeth Conference in 1920.

The Conference heartily endorses that Appeal and reaffirms the principles contained in it and in the Resolutions dealing with Re-union adopted by that Conference.

### *The Malines Conversations*

32. Believing that our Lord's purpose for His Church will only be fulfilled when all the separated parts of His Body are united, and that only by full discussion between the Churches can error and misunderstanding be removed and full spiritual unity attained, the Conference expresses its appreciation of the courage and Christian charity of Cardinal Mercier in arranging the Malines Conversations, unofficial and not fully representative of the Churches though they were, and its regret that by the Encyclical, *Mortalium animos*, members of the Roman Catholic Church are forbidden to take part in the World Conference on Faith and Order and other similar Conferences.

### *The Eastern Orthodox Church*

33. (*a*) The Conference heartily thanks the Œcumenical Patriarch for arranging in co-operation with the other Patriarchs and the Autocephalous Churches for the sending of an important Delegation of the Eastern Orthodox Church under the leadership of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the help given to its Committee by the Delegation, as well as its sense of the value of the advance made through the joint meetings in the relations of the Orthodox Church with the Anglican Communion.

(*b*) The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion and to invite the Œcumenical Patriarch to appoint representatives of the Patriarchates and Autocephalous Churches of the East to be a Doctrinal Commission, which may, in correspondence and in consultation, prepare a joint statement on the theological points about which there is difference and agreement between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches.

(*c*) The Conference not having been summoned as a Synod to issue any statement professing to define doctrine, is therefore unable to issue such a formal statement on the subjects referred to in the *Résumé*[1] of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria with the other Orthodox Representatives and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, but records its acceptance of the statements of the Anglican Bishops contained therein as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it, in relation to those subjects.

34. The Conference expresses its sympathy with the Church of Russia in its persecution and sufferings, and prays that God, in His mercy, may give liberty and prosperity once more to that Church, that it may again take its place with greater freedom and power of self-expression among the other great Churches of Christendom.

## *The Old Catholic Church*

35. (*a*) The Conference heartily thanks the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of the Old Catholic Church associated with him for coming to consult with its members on the development of closer relations between their Churches and the Anglican Communion, and expresses its sense of the importance of the step taken.

(*b*) The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint representatives of the Anglican Communion, and to invite the Archbishop of Utrecht to appoint representatives of the Old Catholic Churches to be a Doctrinal Commission to discuss points of agreement and difference between them.

(*c*) The Conference agrees that there is nothing in the Declaration of Utrecht[2] inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England.

---

[1] See p. 138.

[2] See p. 142.

## *The Separated Eastern Churches*

36. (*a*) The Conference thanks Bishop Tourian for taking counsel with one of its committees on the relations between the Church and the Anglican Communion, and assures him of its deep sympathy with the sufferings of his nation.

(*b*) The Conference expresses its deep sympathy with the Armenian, East Syrian (Assyrian) and West Syrian Christians in the hardship and suffering which they have endured since the war, and earnestly prays that they may be given strength and courage in their efforts for self-preservation, as well as that their rights may be fully secured as religious or racial minorities in the territories in which they live.

(*c*) The Conference welcomes the development of closer relations between the Anglican Communion and the Separated Churches of the East which is recorded in its Committee's Report, and earnestly desires that these relations may be steadily strengthened, in consultation with the Orthodox Church, in the hope that in due course full intercommunion may be reached.

## *The Church of Sweden*

37. The Conference thanks the Church of Sweden for the visit of the Bishop of Lund and expresses its hope that the existing fraternal relations with that Church will be maintained, and that relations may also be strengthened with the other Scandinavian Churches with a view to promoting greater unity in the future.

## *The Church of Finland*

38. The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury, as soon as seems advisable, to appoint a committee to investigate the position of the Church of Finland and its relations to the Church of England.

## *The Moravians (Unitas Fratrum)*

39. The Conference is grateful to the Moravian Church for sending so important a body of representatives to confer with their committee, and respectfully requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a new committee to confer with a committee of the Moravian Church.

## *South India*

40 (*a*) The Conference has heard with the deepest interest of the proposals for Church union in South India now under consideration between the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon,

the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church of South India, and expresses its high appreciation of the spirit in which the representatives of these Churches have pursued the long and careful negotiations.

(*b*) The Conference notes with warm sympathy that the project embodied in the Proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India is not the formation of any fresh Church or Province of the Anglican Communion under new conditions, but seeks rather to bring together the distinctive elements of different Christian Communions, on a basis of sound doctrine and episcopal order, in a distinct Province of the Universal Church, in such a way as to give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought and the life of the Church Universal.

(*c*) We observe further, as a novel feature in the South Indian Scheme, that a complete agreement between the uniting Churches on certain points of doctrine and practice is not expected to be reached before the inauguration of the union; but the promoters of the scheme believe that unity will be reached gradually and more securely by the interaction of the different elements of the united Church upon one another. It is only when the unification resulting from that interaction is complete that a final judgment can be pronounced on the effect of the present proposals. Without attempting, therefore, to pronounce such judgment now, we express to our brethren in India our strong desire that, as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated. We hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches that are His. In this hope we ask the Churches of our Communion to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous good-will.

(*d*) The Conference thinks it wise to point out that, after the union in South India has been inaugurated, both ministers and lay people of the united Church, when they are outside the jurisdiction of that Church, will be amenable to the regulations of the Province and Diocese in which they desire to officiate or to worship, and it must be assumed that those regulations will be applied to individuals in the same manner as they would now be applied to similarly circumstanced individuals, unless any Province takes formal action to change its regulations.

(*e*) The Conference, fully assured in the light of the Resolutions of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon adopted in February, 1930, that nothing will be done to break the fellowship of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, confidently leaves in the hands of the Bishops of that Church the task of working out in detail the principles which are embodied in the Proposed Scheme.

(*f*) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the Report of its Committee with regard to the Proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India, and commends the Report to the attention of the Episcopal Synod and General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.

### *The Church in Persia*

41. The Conference has heard with deep sympathy of the steps towards union which have been proposed in Persia; it desires to express its sincere appreciation of the missionary zeal of the Church in Persia, and it generally approves the sections in the Report of its Committee dealing with this subject.

### *Special Areas*

42. The Conference, maintaining as a general principle that intercommunion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union, and bearing in mind the general rule of the Anglican Churches that "members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church," holds, nevertheless, that the administration of such a rule falls under the discretion of the Bishop, who should exercise his dispensing power in accordance with any principles that may be set forth by the national, regional or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned. The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who may, in his discretion so exercised, sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas, where the ministrations of an Anglican Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican churches, when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special or temporary circumstances.

*The Conference adopted the following explanatory note.*—In view of the dangers of misconception, we think it desirable to say that in recognising that a Bishop of the Anglican Communion may under very strict regulations and in very special circumstances permit individual communicants to join with members of other Christian bodies in their Services of the administration of the Lord's Supper, we felt bound to consider the difficulties created by present conditions, especially in some parts of the Mission Field. But we would point out that the very special circumstances and the very strict regulations specified in this Resolution of themselves show that we are not departing from the rule of our Church that the minister of the Sacrament of Holy Communion should be a priest episcopally ordained.

### *The Church of Scotland*

43. The Conference expresses its gratitude to the distinguished members of the Church of Scotland[1] who accepted the invitation to confer with its Committee. It hopes that an invitation may soon be issued to the now happily united Church of Scotland to enter into free and unrestricted conference with representatives of the Anglican Communion on the basis of the Appeal to All Christian People issued in 1920.

### *Evangelical Free Churches of England*

44. The Conference cordially thanks the influential Delegation from the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England[2] for attending one of the Sessions of its Committee, and for the help of that Delegation in defining the issues which have still to be resolved before further advance towards organic union is possible. The Conference notes with satisfaction and gratitude the great measure of agreement on matters of faith reached at the Conferences held from 1921 till 1925 between representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and hopes that at an early date such Conferences may be resumed with a view to ascertaining whether the Proposed Scheme of Union prepared for the Churches in South India, or other proposals which have been put forward, suggest lines on which further advance towards agreement on questions of order can be made, and that similar conferences may be held elsewhere.

---

[1] The Very Rev. John White, D.D., and the Hon. Lord Sands, Senator of the College of Justice.

[2] The Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D., the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, M.A., the Rev. J. T. Barkby, the Rev. S. M. Berry, D.D., the Rev. D. Brook, D.C.L., the Rev. Charles Brown, D.D., the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D., the Rev. W. L. Robertson, D.D., the Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D., the Rev. H. J. Taylor and Bishop Arthur Ward.

### *Schemes of Reunion*

45. In view of the various schemes of Re-union and other projects and advances towards union and intercommunion which have been the subject of discussion or negotiation, the Conference reminds the Church that it is a paramount duty to seek unity among Christians in every direction, and assures all who are working for this end of its cordial support in their endeavours; it also reminds the Church that until full and final schemes are set out and terms of intercommunion are definitely arranged, the expression of final judgments on individual schemes is premature.

### *Co-operation in Evangelism*

46. Meanwhile the Conference urges the desirability of organising and participating in efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communions, both as a means of bearing effective witness to the multitudes who are detached from all forms of organised Christianity, and as a means of expressing and strengthening that sense of unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches.

### *Unity among Anglicans*

47. The Conference calls upon all members of the Anglican Communion to promote the cause of union by fostering and deepening in all possible ways the fellowship of the Anglican Communion itself, so that by mutual understanding and appreciation all may come to a fuller apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus, and more perfectly make manifest to the world the unity of the Spirit in and through the diversity of His gifts.

## IV. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

48. The Conference affirms that the true constitution of the Catholic Church involves the principle of the autonomy of particular churches based upon a common faith and order, and commends to the faithful those sections of the Report of Committee IV which deal with the ideal and future of the Anglican Communion.

49. The Conference approves the following statement of the nature and status of the Anglican Communion, as that term is used in its Resolutions :

> The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common :—
>
> (*a*) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches ;
>
> (*b*) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship ; and
>
> (*c*) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference.

The Conference makes this statement praying for and eagerly awaiting the time when the Churches of the present Anglican Communion will enter into communion with other parts of the Catholic Church not definable as Anglican in the above sense, as a step towards the ultimate reunion of all Christendom in one visibly united fellowship.[1]

### *The Consultative Body*

50. (*a*) The Conference re-affirms the opinion expressed in Resolution 44 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, " that the Consultative Body is of the nature of a continuation committee of the Lambeth Conference, and neither possesses nor claims any executive or administrative power."

The Conference recommends that :

(*b*) The Consultative Body should be prepared to advise on questions of faith, order, policy or administration, referred to it by any Bishop or group of Bishops, calling in expert advisers at its discretion, and reserving the right to decline to entertain any particular question.

---

[1] Compare Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference, 1878, with Report of Committee on the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion. *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 82-83.

Consequently, the Committee of Students of Liturgical Questions appointed in accordance with Resolution 38 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 need not be re-appointed.

(*c*) The usual duties of the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference should be :—

- (i) To carry on the work left to it by the preceding Conference.
- (ii) To assist the Archbishop of Canterbury in the preparation of the business of the ensuing Conference.
- (iii) To deal with matters referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury on which he requests its aid.
- (iv) To deal with matters referred to it by any Bishop or group of Bishops, subject to any limitations upon such references which may be imposed by the regulations of local and regional Churches.

(*d*) Hereafter the members of the Consultative Body should consist of not less than 18 members, appointed to represent the Lambeth Conference by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with due regard to regional requirements, after consultation with the Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops : vacancies being filled in the same way. Further, the first appointment should be made within 18 months of this meeting of the Conference, the present Consultative Body continuing to function in the meantime, and those then appointed should hold office until the next meeting of the Conference.

## *Appellate Tribunal*

51. The Conference, believing the formation of a central Appellate Tribunal to be inconsistent with the spirit of the Anglican Communion, holds that the establishment of final Courts of Appeal should be left to the decision of local and regional Churches.

## *Provincial Organisation*

52. Saving always the moral and spiritual independence of the Divine Society, the Conference approves the association of Dioceses or Provinces in the larger unity of a " national Church," with or without the formal recognition of the Civil Government, as serving to give spiritual expression to the distinctive genius of races and peoples, and thus to bring more effectually under the influence of Christ's Religion both the process of government and the habit of society.

53. (*a*) In view of the many advantages of the organisation of Dioceses into Provinces and the difficulties and dangers of isolation, the formation of Provinces should everywhere be encouraged.

(*b*) The minimum organisation essential to provincial life is a College or Synod of Bishops which will act corporately in dealing with questions concerning the faith, order and discipline of the Church.

(*c*) The minimum number of Dioceses suitable to form a Province is four.

(*d*) The balance between provincial authority and diocesan autonomy may vary from province to province according to the constitutions agreed upon in each case.

54. Without prejudice to the provisions of any constitution already adopted by any Province or Regional Church, the Conference advises that when the Bishops of a group of Dioceses under the oversight of the Archbishop of Canterbury or attached to some other Province have prepared and accepted a tentative constitution for a Province, they should notify this to the authorities under which they have hitherto worked, and request that the new Province be recognised as such and that they be released from obedience to other authority, as far as is necessary to enable them to subscribe to the constitution of the new Province, and (if so required) take the oath of canonical obedience to its Metropolitan. If this request be granted, the new Province may then be formally constituted. The proper procedure would be that the Bishops and clergy should subscribe to its constitution and that the Bishops (if so required) should take the oath of canonical obedience to its Metropolitan. The Metropolitan or Presiding Bishop should thereupon notify all Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops in the Anglican Communion of the formation of the Province.

55. Where the office of Metropolitan is attached to a particular See, the other Dioceses of the Province should have some effective voice in the election of a Bishop to that See.

56. (*a*) The successive stages at which a newly founded Diocese can be entrusted with greater responsibility, whether for legislation and general government, or for the election of its Bishop, should be determined by the provincial authorities or the Archbishop of Canterbury (as the case may be) in consultation with the Bishop.

(*b*) Where the appointment of a Bishop still remains with the provincial authorities or the Archbishop of Canterbury, it is generally desirable that the Diocese should in some way be consulted before such appointment is made.

57. The Conference recognises with thankfulness the provincial organisation attained in Japan and China, whereby the Nippon Sei Kokwai and the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui have become constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion, and welcomes the Japanese and Chinese Bishops now present for the first time in the history of the Lambeth Conference as Bishops of these Churches.

58. The Conference welcomes the measure of progress already made towards the formation of a single Province in East Africa.

59. In view of differences of standard and qualification for Holy Orders demanded in the various Provinces, the Conference considers the principle of discrimination involved in such regulations as the Colonial Clergy Act to be legitimate, not only in England, but in any Province which so desires.

60. The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee of persons representing each Church concerned to confer with the Church of England Pensions Board on the comprehensive scheme of reciprocal arrangements for Clergy pensions which has been submitted by the Board, so that such representatives may report thereon to their respective Churches.

## V. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

### *The supply and training of men for Holy Orders*

61. Inasmuch as the ministry is the gift of God through Christ and is essential not only to the being and well-being of His Church but also to the extension of His kingdom; and inasmuch as our Lord taught us to pray for its increase, the Conference expresses the hope that regular and earnest prayer for the ministry may be offered, and teaching about vocation may be given, throughout the whole Church both at the Ember seasons and at other times.

The Conference is convinced not only that it is the duty of the Church to foster vocation to the ministry but that it behoves every clergyman, schoolmaster, parent, and indeed every Christian man and woman to seek out and encourage signs of such vocation.

62. While recognising with gratitude the support given in recent years to funds which assist the training of candidates for the ministry, and while believing that those who have heard the call should exercise all possible self-help in responding to it, the Conference places on record its conviction that it is the privilege and duty of the Church to find, when necessary, the means for the training of those whom God has called.

63. In view of the rise in the standard of education and of the constantly increasing opportunities of University training, the Conference deems it important that candidates for Holy Orders should in most cases be graduates of a University as well as properly trained in the special studies which belong to their calling.

The Conference expresses the hope that the Church will take every opportunity both for seeking and for training candidates in new Universities which have been established in great cities and elsewhere. With a view to promoting theological study in these and other Universities, the Conference recommends that, where the conditions allow, the Church should establish theological colleges in close connection with Universities, and should join with the representatives of other Churches in establishing theological faculties in them.

64. In the matter of special preparation of candidates for the ministry, the Conference regards a competent knowledge of the Bible, of Christian worship, history, theology and morals, and pastoral work, together with training in the devotional life, as of the first importance. To this should be added instruction in reading and preaching. Beyond this we are anxious not to overload the curriculum of our theological colleges, but we believe it to be advantageous that students should be given such elementary instruction in psychology, the art of teaching, social economics and other studies bearing upon their life-work as will encourage them to maintain their interest in these subjects after ordination. We express the hope that greater efforts will be made to stimulate the intellectual and spiritual life of the clergy especially in the earlier years of their service.

65. The Conference for reasons given in the Report of its Committee on the ministry cannot recommend a widespread adoption of the proposal that men of mature age and assured position might be called by authority, and, if willing, ordained to the priesthood without being required to give up their present occupation. But while declaring that ordination to the priesthood involves full and lifelong service, not to be made subservient to any other interests, it sees no insuperable objection to the ordination, with provincial sanction and under proper safeguards, where the need is great, of such *Auxiliary Priests*.

Further, in order to meet the present pressing need, the Conference would not question the action of any Bishop who, with the sanction of the national, regional or provincial Church concerned, should authorise such licensed *Readers* as he shall approve to administer the chalice at the request of the parish priest.

### *The Ministry of Women*

66. The Conference wishes to insist on the great importance of offering to women of ability and education, who have received adequate special training, posts which provide full scope for their powers and bring to them real partnership with those who direct the work of the Church, and genuine responsibility for their share of it, whether in parish or diocese; so that such women may find in the Church's service a sphere for the exercise of their capacity.

67. The Order of *Deaconess* is for women the one and only Order of the ministry which we can recommend our branch of the Catholic Church to recognise and use.

68. The Ordination of a Deaconess should everywhere include Prayer by the Bishop and the Laying on of Hands, the delivery of the New Testament to the candidate, and a formula giving authority to execute the office of a Deaconess in the Church of God. Such ordination need not be at the Ember seasons, and should not be combined with an ordination of Priests or Deacons, but should always be held in the face of the Church.

69. The Conference re-asserts the words in Resolution 49 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, viz. :—"The office of a Deaconess is primarily a ministry of succour, bodily and spiritual, especially to women, and should follow the lines of the primitive rather than of the modern Diaconate of men." It should

be understood that the Deaconess dedicates herself to a life-long service, but no vow or implied promise of celibacy should be required as necessary for admission to the Order.

70. Under the sanction of the Province, the Bishop may, on the request of the Parish Priest, entrust the following functions to the ordained Deaconess :—

(*a*) to assist the minister in the preparation of candidates for Baptism and for Confirmation.

(*b*) to assist at the administration of Holy Baptism by virtue of her office.

(*c*) to baptize in church, and to officiate at the Churching of Women.

(*d*) in church to read Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany, except such portions as are reserved to the Priest, and to lead in prayer; with the licence of the Bishop, to instruct and preach, except in the service of Holy Communion.

71. The Conference recommends that Bishops give commissions to women of special qualifications to speak at other than the regular services, or to conduct retreats, or to give spiritual counsel.

72. Every stipendiary woman-worker, whether parochial or other, should receive formal recognition from the Bishop, who should satisfy himself not only of her general fitness, but also that an adequate stipend is secured to her with provision for a pension, and that she works under a definite form of agreement.

### *The Ministry of Healing*

73.—(*a*) The Conference commends to the Church *The Ministry of Healing* (S.P.C.K., 1924), being the Report of a Committee set up in accordance with Resolution 63 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

(*b*) Methods of Spiritual Healing, such as Unction or the Laying on of Hands, should be used only in close conjunction with prayer and spiritual preparation.

(*c*) There is urgent need for co-operation between clergy and doctors since spiritual and physical treatment are complementary and equally necessary for true well-being.

(*d*) Seeing that the ministry of the Church is a ministry for the whole man, it is of the utmost importance that the Clergy should equip themselves for a fuller understanding of the intimate connexion between moral and spiritual disorders and mental and physical ills.

### *Religious Communities*

74. The Conference recognises with thankfulness the growth of Religious Communities both of men and women in the Anglican Communion and the contribution which they have made to a deeper spiritual life in the Church and their notable services in the mission field, but advises the establishment, by Canon or other means, of closer co-operation between the Episcopate and the Communities on the general lines indicated in the Report of the Committee.

## VI. YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION

75. The Conference commends the Report of the Committee on Youth and its Vocation to the careful attention of the Church and hopes that in all parts of the Anglican Communion the Bishops, with the assistance of the Clergy and Laity, particularly those qualified to represent youth, will face the facts of the situation and the challenge which they constitute to the whole Christian Church; believing that the great tasks before the Church to-day call for a new measure of devotion to Christ and His Church on the part of all, both young and old.

# REPORTS
# OF
# COMMITTEES

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports.*

*The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above.*

⁂ *An asterisk placed after the name of any Member of Committee denotes that he was unable to attend any of the Meetings of that Committee.*

# CONTENTS

PAGE

I. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD—
  (*a*) In relation to Modern Thought ... ... 65
  (*b*) In relation to Non-Christian Religions and Ideals ... ... ... ... ... ... 72
  (*c*) To be realised throughout the Church by Teaching and Study ... ... ... ... 76
  (*d*) As determining the Character of Christian Worship ... ... ... ... ... 80

II. THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY—
  (*a*), (*b*) Marriage and Sex ... ... ... ... 85
  (*c*) Race ... ... ... ... ... ... 95
  (*d*) Peace and War... ... ... ... ... 98

III. THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH—
  The Principles of the Lambeth Appeal ... ... 110
  The Lausanne Conference ... ... ... 120
  Unity in the Anglican Communion ... ... 121
  Steps towards Union in Persia ... ... ... 122
  The South India Scheme ... ... ... ... 123
  The Roman Catholic Church ... ... ... 130
  The Orthodox Eastern Church ... ... ... 131
  The Old Catholics ... ... ... ... ... 140
  The Separated Churches of the East ... ... 144
  The Church of Sweden ... ... ... ... 148
  The Moravians ... ... ... ... ... ... 149

IV. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION—
  Its Ideal and Future ... ... ... ... 152
  Organisation—Central (The Consultative Body) 155
  Organisation—National, Provincial and Diocesan 157
  Interchange of Clergy ... ... ... ... 162
  Clergy Pension Fund ... ... ... ... 163

V. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH—
  (*a*) Supply of Men for Holy Orders, and the Church's Duty to Provide for them... ... 164
  (*b*) The Training of Clergy Before and After Ordination ... ... ... ... ... 169
  (*c*) Voluntary Clergy ... ... ... ... 175
  (*d*) Deaconesses—The Ministry of Women ... 177
  (*e*) Spiritual Healing ... ... ... ... 182
  (*f*) Religious Communities ... ... ... 183

VI. YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION ... ... ... ... 188

## No. I

# THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD

## (*a*) In Relation to Modern Thought

The supreme need of the world is to find some unifying principle which may give confidence to the soul of man in face of the distractions of the present time and the uncertainties of the intellectual situation. It must be clearly recognised that many honest minds find themselves unable to accept the system of thought which has been handed down to them by tradition. We have the deepest sympathy with those who are troubled by the doubts which thus arise, and we share their sense of difficulty in resolving them. We hold, indeed, that religious thought and life will be strengthened by this striving after spiritual assurance. We welcome a new note of sincerity in many of the aspirations characteristic of the present generation. And we observe that this note is manifesting itself in movements of thought in many parts of the world.

Up to the present time religion has been a potent factor in the development of humanity; and we believe that religious instincts and the sense of the need for religion are growing in strength. It may be that they do not manifest themselves

Names of Members of the Committee :—

Archbishop of Armagh (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Bendigo.
Bishop of Birmingham.
Bishop of Buckingham.*
Bishop of Carlisle.
Bishop of Colombo.
Bishop of Colorado.
Bishop of Fond du Lac.*
Bishop of Gibraltar.
Bishop of Goulburn.
Bishop Green.
Bishop of Iowa.
Bishop of Jarrow.
Bishop of Knaresborough.
Bishop in Kobe.
Bishop Lang.
Bishop of Lebombo.
Bishop of Liverpool.
Bishop of Lucknow.
Archbishop of Melbourne.
Bishop of Middleton.*
Bishop of Nagpur.
Bishop of New Jersey.
Bishop of North Queensland.
Bishop of Ontario.
Bishop of Oxford.
Bishop of Peterborough (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Sacramento.
Bishop of Southwark.
Bishop of Tennessee.
Bishop of Tuam.
Bishop of Victoria.
Bishop of Waikato.
Bishop of Wangaratta.
Bishop of Western Massachusetts.

everywhere in traditional forms, but they appear in the search for truth and especially for such knowledge as benefits humanity. Idealism, which is at heart religious, also shows itself in the present desire for peace, and in the growing sense of human brotherhood. We see it again in new and untrammelled quests for beauty; in increasing indignation against disregard of human personality; and in a concern for the decencies and sanctities of human life which appears in many forms of social progress. But, side by side with this sincere idealism, there is a lack of vision of the purpose of life, and a need for fundamental faith in human destiny.

In these circumstances we feel it necessary to express our conviction that the Christian Doctrine of God, in its full implications, when rightly understood, supplies the guidance which our perplexed generation so supremely needs.

Certain sciences, whose boundaries were for generations indeterminate, have in recent times united to give us a consentient view of the process by which the world as we know it has come into being. From this view has emerged an account of the order of creation upon which all instructed opinion is now agreed. Physics and astronomy, geology and biology, anthropology and archæology unite to give us a description of the ordered sequence of creation. In view of this revelation, for such it truly is, the popular interpretation of the Biblical account of creation cannot be accepted literally; and it must be remembered that in great ages of constructive theology such a literal interpretation was not regarded as of primary importance.

This new scientific conception, great and illuminating as it is, reveals the unity of creation and a progressive order. We find in the order thus disclosed plain evidence of an age-long purpose which has culminated in the spiritual endowments of man. We hold also, and we find our conviction shared by thinkers in many fields, that a truly creative process must be assumed, that this has been throughout continuous, and that it has involved the emergence of new qualities of being. We regard this creative process as not only spiritual in its results, but also spiritual in its origin.

Scientific methods have led to the conception of laws of nature invariable in their operation. Such laws have been found to be apparently trustworthy within limited regions of nature. Some men of science, generalising this fact, reached the assumption that all changes in the known universe—and from this man is not excluded—could be expressed in terms of invariable sequences. This doctrine excludes the possibility of human freedom, and implies that all the higher aspirations of man are illusory. We reject this doctrine. In our view man's higher faculties point to his possession of a real power of initiative involving responsibility, and to his capacity to discern the true meaning of creation, and not only to apprehend but also to enter into some measure of union with the spiritual Source of his being.

Here at once it must be admitted that we are confronted with the tremendous problem of evil. The cosmic process which has led to man, with his spiritual faculties, has also, for example, led to the production of organisms which have inflicted grievous suffering upon other living things and especially upon man. Suffering seems to be inseparable from the development of life upon the earth. Our belief is that it is bound up with the fact that the processes of organic creation are associated with the gift to living things of some measure of spontaneity, out of which has emerged the freedom possessed by man. The problem of moral evil arises at a later stage of our argument.

The Ground of this creative process, and the Source of the purpose which we find within it, we believe to be God. Thus we hold that God has been continuously active within Creation and that His immanent activity still continues. He is also transcendent in that the whole creation has its source in Him.

The emergence of spiritual consciousness in man not only is a result of Divine activity, but also enables him to enter into some measure of communion with God. Thus in a very true sense man has been made in the image of God, and we discern that man's nature is such that there is some ground of union between God and him. Because divine and human are not mutually exclusive, man can recognise the beauty with which God has adorned the world, and can find within himself the desire to create beauty. So also in the affection shown by animals for their young there is an adumbration of the Divine love, and in the highest ideals which the human conscience recognises there is a revelation of the ideals present to the Divine mind. As we survey the cosmic process, we discover within it at once man's desire to be at home in the world and to trace its order, and a reaching out towards a spiritual background involving an intuition of God.

This view of the inner purpose of creation leads to the conviction that the transcendent God, who is the Author of the cosmic process, and is at the same time immanent in it, is not apart from the life of man. He works in man, especially in man's highest faculties, and is the Source of the upward movement which appears in the history of humanity. The Spirit of God, to recall the familiar thought of the Christian faith, is the guide and helper of the spirit of man.

It is from man's intuitive consciousness of God that the historical religions take their origin. Primitive peoples discern an undefined and mysterious potency in the striking objects of their experience. Polytheistic religions combine an attempt to explain Nature with some desire to escape malign influences and also to enter into union with friendly spiritual powers.

The purest and deepest pre-Christian manifestation of spiritual religion, and that of which we have the most complete history, is the monotheistic creed of Israel. Against the constant invasion of polytheistic elements, this splendid faith was developed and maintained by the divinely-given vision of the great Hebrew prophets. Thus the way was prepared for the coming of the Christ. All the lines of human development, including all the higher achievements of the mind and spirit of man, converge towards Him. Yet, though it is true to say that all that was best in the life of man found its fulfilment in Him, the Gospel of Christ was a new thing. It puzzled, and even shocked, the civilisation in which it appeared. It was, as St. Paul writes, "to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness." The newness of the Gospel is the most signal instance of that progressive and creative activity of God which has been manifested in every great epoch in the known history of the Universe. In the earlier stages of man's history, even among the Jews, the knowledge of God was limited, indirect, and detached from some aspects of human life. The Jew had the Law; the Greek had his intellectual and ethical speculation; but the Law gave no power, and the speculation, supplying no compelling motive for conduct, was apart from, and in some ways hostile to, religion. In Christ, as His followers came to believe, there dwelt "the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and, as under the guidance of the Holy Spirit reflection dwelt upon His life, it brought all the varied interests of humanity to the feet of the Father in heaven.

Only in the doctrine of the Incarnation can the relation of Christ to God on the one hand, and His relation to man on the other, find their adequate expression. "The Word (*Logos*) was made flesh and dwelt among us." These words point to the attainment of the purpose of the whole cosmic process through the agency of the immanent Logos or creative thought of God. They bring Christian theology into harmony with that modern view of the order of the universe which has been outlined above. They also indicate the appearance of the Logos in time, and the perfecting of humanity in Jesus Christ. In St. Paul's great saying, it was the purpose of God "unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth." And so in Christ there is that revelation of God which makes Him to be Lord and Master of the life of man. Here is the secret of that compelling insight and power which make men turn to Him in their deepest experiences. He possesses an authority which is unequalled and supreme.

The way in which this was made known to the world began in the preaching of the Apostles. Proclaiming the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, and calling men to accept Him as Saviour and Lord, they who had experienced Pentecost, and were being constantly guided by the Spirit, initiated that great spiritual movement which soon shook the ancient world to its foundations and overwhelmed it in the tide of a new life. A new Power, the Power of the Holy Spirit, was at work among men.

The Christian Society had inherited from the Jewish prophets belief in the one God. But, as its members reflected upon God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Trinity gradually took shape. It was felt that the Divine unity could not be expressed by an analogy derived from a single person. What we term personality in man must be included in God, but personality as we know it in man is not adequate to express fully the Divine nature. This thought comes very near to technical expression in the familiar words " The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all."

The main purport of Christ's teaching was the Fatherhood and Kingdom of God. The ruling principles of the Kingdom as He proclaimed them are righteousness, love, forgiveness and peace. Christ taught that in love God rules the world. Through suffering for righteousness' sake men become the instruments of God's love, as it seeks the salvation of mankind. In this fact the principle of the Cross is revealed. The Cross sums up the struggle of love against evil throughout the ages. Christ's love redeems the world by creating the conditions in which righteousness and love can be all-powerful. Thus " God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." In pre-Christian Israel there was a strong sense of sin and misery, accompanied by the desire for deliverance. The Law, though it set forward for human attainment an ideal of holiness, provided no power by which man could overcome sin or receive holiness. The propitiatory sacrifices enjoined in it were seen by some of the greatest Hebrew prophets to be ineffective and human efforts to attain holiness ended in despair. The early Church, through Christ's example, death and resurrection, experienced a new power to overcome sin. Of this the gladness of the early society of Christians and their joy in the Lord were evidence.

Here the Christians of the first age found in experience the fulfilment of the promise which, according to St. John, Christ made to His disciples. His departure was good for them, because it was the condition of the coming of the Comforter, who would interpret the life and teaching of Christ, and guide the disciples into all the truth. From the first the Apostles recognised in the events of Pentecost the fulfilment of a hope which they could trace back to the Hebrew prophets and psalmists. They felt themselves empowered to transmit and administer this gift; they completed the baptism of the Samaritan converts by the laying on of hands; they baptised Cornelius and his friends when these had already shown evidence of the reception of the Holy Spirit; they determined new issues, such as that of the circumcision of Gentile converts, and claimed the authority of the Holy Spirit for their decision. The Spirit had made them free to go forward with sureness of mind, in the strength which He had given them.

This power is not restricted in its bearing to the internal affairs of the Church; it has a message for the world. The Spirit will reveal the true meaning of sin and righteousness and judgment by throwing upon the world the light of the revelation of Christ. The world has its thoughts on all these things, and strives after its own ideals, but the final truths of them all is not attained till, through the consecration and illumination of the Spirit, they have been brought into conformity with the message which comes from Christ.

The existence of evil in the world has seemed, and still seems to many, to destroy belief in a loving God. We believe that a truer insight finds that at least moral evil is bound up with man's possession of freedom. So far as we can see, a universe of spiritual beings capable of responding to the love of God could not exist apart from the power of choice in His creatures. Were there no possibility of evil, there would be only *automata* in the Kingdom of God. It would not be a realm of free spirits. As Christ taught, we are responsible beings, who serve God best by struggling against evil. And the Christian triumph over evil does not consist in the analysis or discovery of the conditions which give rise to evil: it is rather to be found in the continual creation of new situations in which evil is vanquished by the creative love of God. We do not forget that St. Paul, while aware of the problem of evil, offers no immediate solution of it. To his mind, it affects all creation as well as mankind; he looks forward to the consummation of God's purpose in which alone the problem can be finally solved.

Recent discoveries of the size of the stellar universe have emphasised the apparent insignificance of the planet on which we live. Many tend to think that man's own insignificance in God's sight has thereby been established. We feel that in this notion there is a confusion between physical and moral insignificance. Man's value in God's sight depends upon his spiritual qualities, and in particular upon the extent to which he can enter into communion with God. Apart from spiritual apprehension there is for man in the universe neither order nor beauty nor vastness nor sublimity.

Man, as a spiritual being, inevitably seeks God in prayer. But prayer must be in no sense the selfish seeking of personal ends. It must be always subordinate to the universal purpose of God. Hence its true aim is not the effort to induce God to change His mind, but the bringing of the desire of man into harmony with the mind and will of God, thus making possible the fulfilment of His purpose. From such harmony comes also a deeper insight into the glory and love of God.

Passing thus beyond petitionary prayer, which we shall consider later, we reach types of meditation which belong to the highest regions of worship. Such meditation is akin to what is called "mystical experience." At its fullest this is an experience in which the subject believes that he has direct and immediate contact with the Source and Ground of all being. The mystic affirms that, normally, God is veiled, so that His presence is indirectly apprehended and His nature inferred; but that there come states when the veils are drawn aside and supreme Reality is disclosed.

The Reality thus disclosed and apprehended yields a supreme satisfaction. But, though the intense happiness of the mystical state is always a treasured memory to those who have received it, the experience itself does not provide material for detailed positive description. The vague sense of fellowship with the unseen which it yields is, in consequence, interpreted in different ways by those who have inherited different religious traditions. In the East it is commonly associated with a pantheistic explanation of the Universe.

We reject pantheism because any theory which assumes that man, as belonging to the realm of nature, is divine must of necessity imply that evil exists within God. We hold that the universe is irrational unless the character of God is expressed by the perfect goodness which the best of mankind instinctively seek. We believe that God can manifest Himself through nature to man; but the divine is not to be identified with nature, nor, in particular, with man. In short, the results of God's creative activity must not be confused with His Being.

Mystical experience is rightly interpreted by that positive revelation of God which culminated in Jesus Christ. In Him the mystical apprehension is translated into the terms of human life and issues in moral purity and practical religion. According to the tenor of Christ's teaching the happiness which results from mystical experience is mis-used if it is sterile. The sense of divine peace and joy which it yields must be an incentive to the struggle against evil in all its forms. Thus the duty which results from true religious understanding was summed up by Christ in the words " Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." Here is found the quality which marks the mysticism which is distinctively Christian. But there is nothing in Christ's teaching to indicate that mystical experience is the only or highest way of access to God. All who come to God in simplicity of heart and are in the way of His service are counted among His children.

The greatest and best men of action have always felt that they were building on eternal foundations. Though labour and the conflict with evil are in time, their results are of eternal value. We labour for that which is imperishable. The earthly life is no illusion, for nothing within it worthy of God's approval will be lost. His children will not perish, neither will their work. Suffering and death become of moral value in the universe, when through them victories over evil are won. Thus Augustine could rightly speak of Christ as " Victor because Victim."

### (*b*) IN RELATION TO NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS AND IDEALS

The revelation of the character of God through Jesus Christ was from the beginning regarded by Christians as made not to any one race or nation but to all mankind, and as capable both of being apprehended by all men and of being expressed in a way of life. So apprehended and so expressed it is to bring in the Kingdom of God, in which God's Name is hallowed and His Will done on earth as in heaven.

In the world to-day two thirds of mankind still remain non-Christian, and this vast body of men is to be found in the ranks of the great non-Christian religions—Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism and Shinto —as well as of the primitive cults. Among these religions are two which boldly claim the same universal scope as Christianity, namely, Islam and Buddhism. The Christian doctrine of God is met in Islam by the clear and definite assertion of the being and reality of God, and in Buddhism by the law of compassion and mercy. The Moslem is one who submits to the unmitigated power of the unique God, all powerful, irresistible, autocratic and absolute, the creator and the judge. This remote deity has a definite relation to the world ; his very omnipotence brings him virtually near, not only in the Prophet and the heaven-sent Book, but also in the regular devotion and deep reverence of Moslem worship and practice. The stress laid on the omnipotence of God issues in daily life in a more or less rigid fatalism. It is true that ideas of love and pity are present in some of the " wonderful names " of God, *e.g.*, the compassionate, the guardian, the forgiver and others, but it is on this side that Islam is weakest. The Quran tells of Jesus Christ, but the picture is quite different from the picture in the Gospels. Islam's strength is in its faith in the majesty of God as the eternal king of the ages, and its weakness lies in its failure to include holiness and love in his character. The Christian God is good and all-ruler, but the acts of Allah are all powerful and irresistible to the extent that they are not conditioned by moral distinctions. Apart, therefore, from the mediation of the Prophet, Islam has no mediator and certainly no Saviour. Sin is not necessarily abhorrent to God, who is not thought of as aware of the need of any atonement.

In Buddhism the law of compassion and mercy in this world has been strongly realised and obeyed, but it was as a way of escape from the sorrows of a world in which the idea of the existence of God was absent. This is how the religion was originally taught in India. It was a reform of Hinduism and a revolt against the Brahminical pantheon. The emphasis was laid on moral and intellectual self-discipline, and the practice of *yoga* and trance was the means employed. The thought of God is absent from Buddhism in its original form, but the human desire for an object of worship led to the Buddha himself being deified. Northern Buddhism as developed in China, Korea and Japan has deified not only the Buddha but also the founders of the sects. Buddhism is more than negation or pessimism. It adopted a mysticism which is of positive value and retained the Hindu theory of transmigration. It clung to the strong desire for emancipation from self, and taught the Four Noble Truths and the Eightfold Noble Path as the way of escape from the cycle of rebirth. It has a law of conduct for this world leading ultimately to Nirvana, a conception which some interpret as annihilation, but which to many of the best Buddhists appears positive rather than negative, a state of bliss unspeakable, to be contrasted with the wandering, *Samsara*, of this world.

The other great religions and systems of thought and ethics, such as Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism and Shinto, have this in common that they are confined in scope and outlook to those born into certain nations, and make no claim to be universal.

In theistic Hinduism God (*Brahma*) is impersonal. The impersonal is held to be a higher category than personality, since personality implies limitation. Brahma is neuter, absolute, eternal, the only reality. Existence, cognition, bliss (*sat-chitananda*) is all that can be predicated of "It." The universe and all that is in it is therefore illusion (*maya*), having only a temporal existence: it began in time and must have an end. It is such stuff as dreams are made of. The soul of man is eternal, passing through a cycle of birth and rebirth, governed by the law of *karma*, till as the result of enlightenment it enters one of the paths that lead to salvation. *Mukti* or deliverance is differently defined in different sects, as non-existence (*nirvana*), absorption into the divine, or as joining up with the all-pervading divine existence, from which in the cycle of re-births it seemed to have been divided. Some sects recoil from this impersonal god and worship one or other of the innumerable gods, which are regarded as manifestations of Brahma. These seek salvation by the way of devotion (*bhakti marg*) to their chosen Lord, and for them salvation is absorption into him. The Christian doctrine of God is founded upon the life of the historic Christ who appeared in Palestine two thousand years ago. This is an offence to the philosophic Hindu who holds that eternal truth cannot be based on historical events. For him history belongs to the phenomenal world and is limited, evanescent and illusory. The Christian doctrine of the Atonement is another stumbling block to Hindu thought. It appears as a denial of the law of *karma*, whereby every man receives the reward or punishment of his own actions. The idea of a suffering god is similarly repugnant to Hindu thought, for it is inconceivable that any ripple of emotion should disturb the serenity of eternal bliss.

The age-long search of Hinduism for the deliverance of the human soul from the sorrows and illusions of earthly life (*mukti*), its pathetic longing for union with God through absorption into his being (*samadhi*), and above all its beautiful ideal of loving devotion expressed in the doctrine of *bhakti*, are the real contribution of abiding spiritual value to religious thought which Hinduism makes.

The inclusiveness of Hinduism with its systems of philosophy, its cults, and vast pantheon is in accord with the spirit of the East. In the Far East there are to be found in China and Japan the religion of the Buddha, the philosophy of Confucius and the way called Shinto.

Confucianism is a semi-religious system in that Confucius was not the founder of any religion. His work was to systematise the ethical ideas based on the family system of social organisation, and his influence at the present extends throughout China, Korea and Japan. The Confucian philosophy has been widely held by those who are Buddhists or Shintoists, and it has been said that " a Japanese is born a Shintoist, lives a Confucianist, and dies a Buddhist." The partial truth of this statement reveals the interpenetration of these systems.

Shinto, " the way of the Gods," is indigenous to Japan, and during the last two generations has revived very widely. It is intensely nationalistic. Its main features are ancestor worship and nature worship, and it believes in the creation of the world by gods. Purity and sincerity of heart are principles of life which are taught and encouraged by ceremony and observance.

In China and Japan the Christian doctrines of the Fatherhood of the One God and the brotherhood of man take up and consecrate loyalty, the family system, and national aspirations in their due place ; and the Christian commemoration of the dead satisfies the desire for filial piety towards the dead as well as the living.

In primitive cults and systems the underlying content of thought is rarely explicit, though certain concepts are explicit in those methods of dealing with life and nature which form what we call primitive religions. The degree of thought which underlies them serves to emphasise two things in their common content, namely, the unity of nature and the sense of awe. Primitive man does not necessarily differentiate between the material and the spiritual. He deals with them in the practical life as one thing. Differentiation appears at a higher stage of thought. Spirits are part and parcel of the fundamental unity of the primitive family or tribe. Such a unity is characteristic, and finds ample place for its full expression in the Christian doctrine of God. God Incarnate, the Spirit of God, Salvation, and the Sacraments of the Church are fundamental concepts which are readily stated in terms of primitive religion and can be presented as giving a way of life which is a practical thing within that mental outlook.

The sense of awe or reverence is equally part of this outlook. To regard the father of the family, or the chief of the tribe, with reverence, to treat the spirits of ancestors with awe, not necessarily with reverence, is to primitive men perfectly natural, and does not imply any " religious " value in the act. Such awe or reverence is the ground-work on which higher conceptions can be built. The Church conceived as a kingdom, with its living head, or as a family with a living Father, leads naturally to the veneration due to a person who is the source or provider. That which is lacking and needs emphasis is the uniqueness of God to whom awe and reverence are due—a worship paid to him alone.

God has not left Himself without witness. We gladly acknowledge the truths contained and emphasised in the great non-Christian religions and systems, but we are not able to admit the widely accepted conclusion that each such religion and system is that which is best suited to the people who hold it, for each of them is less than the gospel of the unsearchable riches of Christ. The majesty of God in Islam, the high moral standards and profound thought in other eastern religions, are approaches to the truth of God revealed in Christ, through whom all men may enjoy access to the Father in one Spirit.

### (c) TO BE REALISED THROUGHOUT THE CHURCH BY TEACHING AND STUDY

We begin this section of our report by a brief consideration of some of the inadequate or unworthy conceptions of God current in the Church itself. If, as we believe, the time has come for a fuller apprehension of His nature, His character, and His relationship with men, then it is for the Church to lead this advance in religious thought and expression. In order to do so it must frankly face the ideas associated with the Divine Name in the popular mind. As in all teaching we here must begin with what is already in the thought of those we teach.

Many of these imperfect conceptions may be traced to the belief, still prevalent, in the equal authority of all parts of the Bible. In spite of the light long since thrown upon the conditions under which its several books were written and upon the progressive revelation of sacred knowledge they record, the Bible is even now too often treated as if every statement about God, contained in every part of it, must find a place in our present apprehension of Him. The result is a confused vision in which early and preparatory thoughts of Him are allowed to intrude upon the revelation of the Divine Being in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. No Christian consciously denies that " he who hath seen me hath seen the Father." Yet there are still many who, out of a mistaken reverence for the Old Testament, insist that all its teaching must be accepted in its literal sense. They have failed to realise that Christ gave His perfect revelation, not indeed by destroying, but by fulfilling and in so far superseding, all past teachings about God.

They have also failed to bring what they learn of the mind and temper of Christ into their conception of God. Thus it is that side by side with a true apprehension of the beauty of Christ's character and a real sense of His abiding presence there co-exists in many minds a thought of God far short of the perfection so revealed. This indicates an intellectual confusion which seems to us most dangerous.

To this double failure may be attributed such errors as the idea that God is alone responsible for all misfortunes not obviously due to human agency; that, for instance, He " sends " disease, wars, catastrophes, untimely deaths, for inscrutable reasons of His own; that these must be accepted for our chastening and punishment because they are " His Will." We cannot deal with the tremendous problem thus raised of the ultimate relation of the Divine and human wills. But we believe that, whatever that relation is, it is itself divinely ordered. It is too often forgotten that our co-operation with God is inspired, guided and used by Him. Thus, for instance, the whole range of human research and effort for the prevention of suffering tends to be regarded as hardly within His concern, and we lose sight of the truth that God has given us powers of mind and will in order that we may be conscious fellow-workers with Him in the development of all good life. On the other hand, there is to be noted a weakened sense of the majesty of God, of reverence for His supreme ordering of human affairs, and of individual dependence upon His daily care. This is due partly to the higher modern standard of physical security and comfort, partly to a sense of all-sufficient human power which scientific discoveries continually impress upon the public mind.

Such misconceptions of the Divine nature in the minds of groups within the Church are often accepted outside it as characteristic of the whole Christian doctrine of God, with the result that people who should be attracted through the Church to the truth which is in Jesus are often actually repelled from it. It seems to them that the Church proclaims a God less perfect than His Son.

There is another group of mistaken ideas about God which is due to inadequate recognition in popular theology of the Holy Spirit, and His operation in the whole course of human history, past and present. In His outlook towards God Jesus claimed the whole of life as the sphere of the Divine activity. Yet some of His modern disciples would limit God's concern within the confines of some selected doctrines, or along the line of one or another approach to Him. The Church is bound to insist in its teaching on the conditions under which alone we can rely on His promised comfort and guidance through the Spirit, but this can and must be done without narrowing our conception of the " God and Father of all, Who is over all, through all, in all." And in these days, as has been already shown, there is revealed to us a new context of the age-long call to exalt Him, to magnify Him, to glorify His name.

Man's apprehension of God must needs be affected by his knowledge of the universe which is God's creation and out of which man as a spiritual being has emerged. We have already referred to the scientific enquiries of the last century, leading to a search for origins and an historic and comparative method of investigation which have changed the whole attitude of the modern world towards the study of religion. It is the duty of the Church to bring together both the new outlook upon nature and the greatly enlarged conception of the scope and field of religious investigation, to determine their relation to the Christian Doctrine of God, and equally to consider whether current ideas of God Himself are adequate to this new revelation of His creative activity. Not otherwise can it fulfil its mission to continue the work on earth of its Founder to whom pre-eminently was given the title of Teacher.

Here there is lost ground to be recovered. The teaching office of the Church has in recent times been overshadowed by other activities, by the serving of tables, by the building up and the maintenance of its organisations, by emphasis on social service, and by hasty and sometimes unnecessary defences thrown up against supposed attacks upon the truth. There has been a lack in sermons, in religious literature, and in instruction generally, of positive and confident teaching upon the sovereignty of God in human life and the need of recognising this as the dominant fact of our environment. This false perspective must be corrected mainly in and through those to whom is committed the teaching office of the Church, and, first among them, through the clergy.

In England the need for a new effort in this direction was set forth by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in a Pastoral Letter to their Provinces in July, 1929. In it they declare that " a renewal of the Church's life and power will not come by mere appeals to the emotions, still less by new organisations. We are convinced that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit it may come if the whole Church will set its thought and prayer towards gaining a fuller apprehension of God, of His self-revelation in Christ, and the wonder and glory of the eternal gospel of His love and grace." The response of the clergy to the Archbishops' appeal has already been remarkable. In nearly every Diocese groups have been formed on a ruri-decanal basis for regular and systematic study and prayer with the purpose of deepening and widening the sense of God's supremacy. With this end in view it has been found that the spiritual lives of individuals have been enlightened and stimulated, disproportionate insistence on matters of secondary importance tends to disappear, and personal knowledge of one another has led to mutual understanding and a new and active sense of fellowship.

We quote this movement, known as " A Way of Renewal," in illustration of an educational tendency which may also be observed elsewhere, as, for instance, in the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, where in each of its eight provinces a series of Summer Schools of Religion has been developed, in which groups of clergy and laity, separately and together, gather for periods of intensive training. Steps are now being taken in England to open the "Way of Renewal" to the laity. Here we thankfully discern a real demand, indeed an actual hunger, for an enlargement of the mind towards God. The Church has ever to contend with the mental inertia of those who cannot or will not bring their minds into the service of their religion. Jesus Himself was continually disappointed by the slow and confused thinking of His disciples. We believe, however, that this intellectual apathy is passing, and that a real desire is awakening in men to love God with all their minds. It is for the Church to meet and guide this new impulse, by seeking and using every means offered in modern life to turn the minds of men towards God.

We pass now to some of the opportunities open to the Church of drawing this way the thought and studies of her own members. But first we would urge that far greater insistence should be laid upon mental discipline and exercise as one of the duties of the Christian life. Too often religious instruction is regarded as completed by the preparation required before Confirmation. Every new communicant should recognise that Confirmation is a new beginning, and that spiritual progress will normally depend upon a growing intellectual apprehension of Christian truth. Study and discussion circles for adolescents and adults should be part of the normal equipment of every parish. We welcome many indications that such activities are being encouraged and assisted both in Great Britain and the British Dominions and in the United States, by Diocesan and Cathedral authorities, and by such central organisations as the Church Tutorial Classes Association. We suggest that all such schemes of study should, wherever possible, bear directly on the highest mental image of God of which mankind is capable, and upon the materials drawn especially from the life of Christ, out of which it can be formed, for we believe this to be a paramount need in religious education at the present time.

But the teaching office of the Church extends beyond its own borders. How far can we affect educational systems not in our control, which nevertheless we are bound to regard as within our concern, and inspire them with religious influence? Here our opportunities vary in the various countries represented in the Anglican Communion. It will be one of the primary tasks of the whole Church in the coming years to discover how by patience and sympathy these openings may be multiplied, and how they may best be used. It seems clear that in all parts of the English-speaking world the public mind is increasingly drawn to the conviction that without religion education must be incomplete. We note also signs of a recognition, expecially in the elementary schools, that knowledge about God is of doubtful value apart from the expression of that knowledge in approach to Him. In England a collection of short services in which teaching is carried into worship has been compiled by one Education Authority and is being adopted by a considerable number of others, and this movement may well spread into Secondary Schools. To make our way into those Universities where no provision exists for religious instruction or observance is much more difficult. But means of contact are being found, as, for instance, in the United States through Student Pastors, and by the Student Christian Movement in many parts of the world.

But whatever be the opportunities open now or yet in store for us, we would here record two convictions. First, that it is by our presentation of God that the world will judge the message we are charged to bring. Whether it be through education, in any of its stages, or by preaching to our own people, or in evangelism addressed to " them that are without," or by the approach to the general public increasingly afforded through the Press, it is by the idea of God so conveyed that we shall attract men to Him. We are further convinced that the true presentation is to be tested by the impulse it creates to worship. Religious thought and study cannot be divorced from the devotional life. And the quality of a man's worship and prayer must always depend on his conception of God.

### (*d*) As Determining the Character of Christian Worship

We have considered the doctrine of God in its relation to certain prominent needs and tendencies of thought at the present time; we have contrasted and compared it with the doctrines contained in religions of a different kind; and we have seen how it must be realised in teaching and study. We have now to deal with it as finding its expression in Christian worship.

In the greatest teaching on worship ever given it is said, " God is spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth." In worship the spirit of man enters into communion with God. This is worship in spirit. It is also evident that the quality of worship depends on the idea of God which is in the mind of the worshipper. Hence worship must be in truth. When man's conception of God is dim and uncertain, the worship of Him will find imperfect or erroneous forms of expression. As God reveals Himself, and man apprehends Him more completely, worship becomes more worthy of God, because more true to His nature.

The Christian doctrine of God is founded on the conception of the One God as revealed to Israel through the teaching of the prophets. On this foundation Christ built a new teaching which, retaining the belief in the holiness and majesty of God, added a more complete revelation of the Father in His tenderness and accessibility. By virtue of His unique relation to God, Jesus Christ revealed the true relation of man to God, and made it certain that man's human nature is capable of intercourse with God. By His teaching and the events of His recorded history, He made possible the fuller revelation of God through the coming of the Spirit. Here emerge the Christian doctrines of prayer and fellowship.

Out of prayer develops all worship. In prayer we seek God, we try to know His will, and to bring our mind into accordance with His purposes. We believe that God answers prayer. He gives counsel in perplexity, strength and courage in times of difficulty. Holding that the laws of nature are His laws, we hold that He is Supreme in the universe, and that there is no limit to the Divine Power in the answering of prayer.

Approach to God through prayer exists in some form wherever there is genuine religion. The advance in the conception of God which comes through the revelation of Jesus Christ brings with it a corresponding change in the conception of prayer. The One to whom our petitions are addressed is more clearly revealed; we pray in the Name of Jesus Christ, who Himself felt the human need of prayer; the Spirit of Christ dwells in the persons and the fellowship by whom the prayer is made, and helps their intercessions.

The Lord's Prayer, which is the model of Christian prayer, is prayer to the Father. It defines the true ends which the Christian should seek in prayer. It places first the glory, the will and the kingdom of God, and from them passes to the satisfaction of the needs of man. In the petition for forgiveness of sin we feel that it unites the whole society with the redeeming work of Christ, and makes the recognition of brotherhood the condition of forgiveness. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit reveals more clearly what is implicit in Christian prayer. The Holy Spirit was given, as seems to be evident from the words of Christ, to the fellowship of the faithful. It is only through the Holy Spirit that intercourse between the fellowship and God, whether through petition, intercession, or thanksgiving, becomes efficacious. It follows, therefore, that prayer, whether of the society or of individuals, must be regarded as an essential and obligatory activity of the Christian life.

This characteristic activity of the Spirit-bearing body distinguishes what is strictly Christian worship from other forms of approach to God. It was to preserve freedom for this activity that the Christian Church transformed the Jewish Sabbath into the weekly feast of the Resurrection. Out of this activity arose the characteristic forms of Christian worship preserved and developed in the history of the Church. The form of such worship naturally includes prayer, praise and thanksgiving, the reading and preaching of the Word, the expression of penitence, the proclamation of forgiveness, the recital of the Christian creed, and the declaration of God's love and peace. The prescribed worship of the Church keeps steadily before its members the bearing of the Christian faith in its entirety on Christian life.

It is not too much to say that, as its power of liturgical expression has developed, the Church has brought within its schemes of worship all the main events of every human life from birth to death. This principle is illustrated also by the practice of those Christian bodies which have discarded, or not adopted, prescribed liturgies.

As we look back upon the history of religion, one feature of pre-Christian religions which forces itself upon our attention is the difficulty which men felt of being sure that through their prayers and their sacrifices they did in truth come in contact with God. The Psalms here and there lay stress upon this difficulty, which is apparent also elsewhere in the Old Testament. The recognition of the fact of the Incarnation entailed the disappearance of the old sacrificial system. But by the institution of the two great Sacraments were provided two means of access to spiritual reality of the efficacy of which there could be no doubt. The Church has always taught that in baptism the recipient really becomes a member of the Body. Similarly, the Church teaches that in the Eucharist the worshippers commemorate, present and claim their part in the Sacrifice made once for all upon the Cross.

For this reason the Church claims that the Eucharist is the climax of Christian Worship. In it the whole society consciously approaches the throne of God and in it becomes sensitively aware of His Presence, realising that the barrier between man and God is finally removed by the sacrifice which the Eucharist commemorates. And once more it becomes evident from the significance of this service and the part which it is intended to play in all lives disciplined by the Christian Doctrine of God, that worship, especially Eucharistic worship, is an essential and not an accidental element in human devotion.

The Christian Doctrine of God as we have seen has many aspects. Owing to this fact two tendencies have become apparent in the development of the worship of the Church which emphasise unduly certain elements in that doctrine. (1) The arresting attractiveness of Christ's life on earth has led men so to concentrate their worship upon the human Christ as to obscure His relation to the Father. This tendency is only too common in many popular hymns. (2) There is a tendency through reflection upon the Incarnation to limit the presence of Christ to the Eucharist, and even, within the Eucharist, to the consecrated elements. This has shown itself in some of the modern Western forms of Eucharistic devotion. The former of these tendencies overlooks the new revelation of God given in the coming of the Holy Spirit; the latter, besides applying material categories to spiritual realities, obscures the active participation of the Spirit-bearing society in the Eucharistic action.

We have thought it necessary to criticise certain tendencies in contemporary worship which we consider to be dangerous; but nothing could be further from our intention than to discourage true devotion to our Blessed Lord. We recognise that a passionate devotion to Him has ever been the secret of the most heroic service. We recognise also that it is only through such devotion to Him that men have advanced in their knowledge of His Nature and may hope to penetrate further into the mysteries of God. The heart and core of devotion is the immediate response upon the part of worshippers to the love of Christ anticipating their thoughts and needs. Such elemental religion is not discoverable in the formally orthodox devotions of those who lack the intimate sense of Christ's abiding Presence. It may be discovered sometimes in forms and modes of worship which when strictly scrutinised may seem to lead away from the truest doctrine of God. And we fully admit that outside the prescribed liturgical order of Church worship there is both need for experiment and room for a large variety of expression in Christian devotion. Of recent years the value of set times within worship for silence and meditation has been newly realised. There is also need and room for extemporary prayer and for other modes of devotion which provide a fuller liberty of worship. But in all such extensions of Christian worship the regulative principle must be found in what Christ Himself taught us. Neither intellectual clarity in the formulation of doctrine nor intensity of devotion to a present Person are of themselves sufficient, taken singly, to constitute true worship. We worship the Father through the Son by means of the Holy Spirit. And they that worship must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth.

(Signed) CHARLES F. ARMAGH

*Chairman*

## No. II

# THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

*The Committee submit the following Report to the Conference on The Life and Witness of the Christian Community, individual and corporate, with special reference to the questions of—*

(a) (b) *Marriage and Sex;* (c) *Race;* (d) *Peace and War.*

*The whole Committee is responsible for the Reports and Resolutions. The names of the Bishops who served on the different sub-committees will be found indicated in the list appended to this Report. Neither in the whole Committee nor in the sub-committees was the support given unanimous, but in each case the Report and the Resolutions were approved by considerable majorities.*

Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Albany (P).
Bishop of Armidale (M).
Bishop of Bermuda (R).
Bishop of Birmingham*.
Bishop of Blackburn (M).
Archbishop of Capetown (R).
Bishop of Central Tanganyika (R).
Bishop of Chester (M).
Bishop of Chichester (P).
Bishop of Chota Nagpur (M).
Bishop of Cork (M).
Bishop of Derby (R).
Bishop of Derry (M)
Bishop of Dover (M).
Bishop of Erie (P).
Bishop of Exeter (M).
Bishop of Fredericton (M).
Bishop of Grafton (P).
Bishop HacKenley (Nova Scotia) (M)
Bishop of Hereford (M).
Bishop Hine (R).
Bishop Howells (Niger) (R).
Bishop of Idaho (M).
Bishop of Johannesburg (R).
Bishop of Kensington (M).
Bishop of Kingston (M).
Bishop in Kwangsi Hunan (M).
Bishop of Lewes (P).
Bishop of Lichfield (P).
Bishop of Lincoln (M).
Bishop of Llandaff (P).
Bishop of Long Island (P).
Bishop of Los Angeles (R).
Bishop of Malmesbury (M).
Bishop of Mexico (R).
Bishop of Michigan (M).
Bishop of Nassau (M).
Bishop of Nebraska (R).
Bishop of New Guinea (M).
Bishop of New Jersey (M).
Bishop of Newcastle (M).
Bishop of the Niger (M).
Bishop Perrin (P).
Bishop of Pittsburgh*.
Bishop of Plymouth (P).
Bishop of Polynesia (R).
Bishop of St. Albans (M).
Bishop of St. Arnaud (P).
Bishop of St. Edmondsbury and Ipswich (M).
Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria (R).
Bishop of Salisbury (P).
Bishop of Sheffield (M).
Bishop of Sierra Leone (R).
Bishop of Singapore (P).
Bishop of South Dakota (R).
Bishop of Southwark (M).
Bishop of Southwell (M).
Bishop of the Upper Nile (R).
Bishop of Washington (P).
Bishop of Western North Carolina (R).
Bishop of Winchester (M).

(M) indicates membership of sub-committee on Marriage and Sex.
(R) ,, ,, ,, ,, Race.
(P) ,, ,, ,, ,, Peace and War.

# THE LIFE AND WITNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

## (*a*) (*b*) MARRIAGE AND SEX

## REPORT

### *General Introduction*

Sex is a God-given factor in the life of mankind, and its functions are therefore essentially noble and creative. Correspondingly great is the responsibility for the right use of it. We place this in the forefront of our report, for, as it seems to us, a new day has dawned, in which sex and sex-matters are emerging from the mists of suspicion and even shame, in which for centuries they have been enveloped, into the clear atmosphere of candour, honesty, and truth. The complete openness with which such subjects are discussed is on the whole to the good, for they have been taken from the obscurity of half-secret conversation and brought out into the cold light of knowledge and experience. Nor is this all. A veritable revolution has taken place in regard to the position of woman, and this, in countries where for centuries she has been the victim of a hide-bound tradition. In spite of our Lord's attitude and teaching it has taken a long time for men to emancipate themselves from the notion of women as chattels, particularly in the things of marriage and sex, and in many parts of the world this emancipation is far from complete. More and more, however, in Western civilisations, not only is woman in numerous cases economically independent, but an ideal of comradeship between men and women is winning its way, in which the characteristic features of the male and the female are finding a more delicate blend and balance. Such a movement cannot but have exaggerations, particularly in connection with the relationship of marriage, but in this lofty ideal of a true partnership between man and woman in all the concerns of life there is high promise, though the ethical adjustments demand careful thought and must needs take time. According to this ideal sex is not merely viewed from the animal standpoint, but is lifted to the level of the high spiritual interests of life.

In its fulness this ideal is specifically Christian, for the Christian sees life steadily and sees it whole, just because he sees it against an eternal background. He is a creature of two worlds. His ideal is not an enjoyment limited by death, but an unlimited development of character in which the relationships of this life are at once the tests and the accessories of growth. It is indeed life on the grand scale. A new dimension is introduced. Therein is involved the eternal nature of love, the worth-whileness of any discipline and sacrifice by which the self is purified and therefore enhanced ; the beauty of an asceticism which regarding the body and its creative powers as essentially God-like, keeps it at all costs healthy and holy ; and that power of love, deeply tinged with sacrifice, which makes of the relationships of life a joyful and often heroic adventure.

Against this background of thought and revelation we set the facts and ideals of sex and marriage. Sex-life, we maintain, is a primary part of the process of soul-education by which we grow towards the fulfilment ofGod's intention for all His children. This approach to the whole matter we believe is not only true in itself, but is the only view in which the various facts and phases of sex-life are seen in their right perspective.

We are fully aware that this view is in violent contrast to much in present day thought and practice. For thousands the eternal background is out of sight or is regarded as unreal. For them sex-life is mainly physical. There is a breaking loose from old restraints, and a process of secularisation is advancing in almost every country of the world. Self-expression is demanded ; but of which self ? Personality is complex ; indeed, in some sense each human has a double personality, and it is not clear whether it is " the old man " (in St. Paul's phrase) or the " new " which makes this claim. Self-expression may be the utterance of a disciplined personality or it may be indistinguishable from an appetite for the " whole world " of pleasure and satisfaction at the expense of one's own soul. Moreover, in many quarters Christian morality is receiving the treatment frequently accorded to Christian doctrine. It is disowned and even repudiated. This attitude is encouraged and extended by the multitudinous stimulants to an exaggerated sex consciousness which abound in our day, and to which the stage, the novel and the film, all make their contribution. Certainly our age is marked in all classes of society by an open and avowed laxity which, if unchecked, must lead to disaster. It is not enough to denounce. There is need for a Christian philosophy of sex and of purity in sex-relations, in contradistinction to the hedonistic and materialistic philosophy which in its immediate outcome is at once so captivating and so convenient.

Towards such a Christian philosophy we would seek to point the way. We believe that this aspect of life was included in our Lord's great declaration : " I am come that they might have life," and that in following His teaching on purity and marriage, not least where it leads to sacrifice, the fullest development of the joy of sex-relationships will be found. From this standpoint the life-long union of two personalities " joined together by God " is the sacramental exhibition of manhood and womanhood at their best, each finding in its union with the other a strength and a beauty which transcends them both. They become one. It follows that purity in both partners is the high approach to this " holy estate " ; that divorce is its destroyer ; and that on this Divine ideal of marriage depends the health of all family life.

### *The Need of Education*

All this emphasises the responsibility of the Church for training her children in that attitude to all sex-questions which is at once open and reverent, so that they see them to be part of that divinely-ordered framework within which life is to be lived and character is to grow. And this means education.

In our judgment instruction should be given to every child in the functions of the body before he or she becomes emotionally interested in the matter. This should be done as soon as the child begins to ask questions. Shame and secrecy in these matters need not exist for the child. He only learns them if and when he discovers the facts in undesirable ways. No child should be sent to school before his father or mother has forearmed him with the knowledge. Though this parental responsibility is frequently refused, we call upon all our people who have young children to face it, and we acknowledge that they have a right to look to the Church for guidance in their delicate task. This, however, is only the beginning. There is grave need that in schools of all types such instruction should be given as will enable the children, particularly as they approach adolescence, to look at the whole question of sex, whether in plants, animals or man, in its rightful setting as essentially part of God's unceasing creative activity. We are aware that this is often done more effectively in the informal contacts of teachers and learners than in definite courses of instruction ; but the whole matter needs the careful attention of educationists at the present time, and particularly of those who have to deal with young children.

The problem of the adolescent is not less pressing and here, again, the personal contacts of teachers and taught are vital for its solution. This is the period of emotional friendships and hero-worship, and reasonable scope should be provided for their expression in wholesome ways. All this training, however, should be an approach to that sanctuary of " married bliss " to which, though often unconsciously, the normal boy or girl looks forward.

Engagement, if and when it comes, should find them not merely equipped with that knowledge which is entirely compatible with innocence, but already accustomed to that whole setting of the sex-life—divine and beautiful—to which we have alluded. We also think that there should be special preparation for marriage for persons between their engagement and the wedding. This need not be official or elaborate. It may be done, in part at least, through suitable literature. But the need for it is evident. We acknowledge that though the Church has set before her members the highest ideal of marriage she has done but little to train them for it. Seeds of divorce are sown sometimes in the early years of marriage, which, if the couple had been properly prepared, would not have found a congenial soil. Is it fair for the Church to expect Christ's standard of marriage from those who have never been adequately taught its implications and who have been allowed to approach that " holy estate " without any serious effort on the part of the Church to instruct them? Yet this is the case, we fear, with many couples who give notice of an intended marriage. We appeal to all whom it may concern to give careful thought to ways and means of affording this education to all who will receive it.

From this the transition is direct to the responsibility of the clergy. Not every parish priest, perhaps not many parish priests, are competent to undertake the kind of education to which we have referred. There is need for a very large increase of the study of moral theology among the clergy. This should be provided in theological colleges, but it may also be undertaken, and sometimes more effectively, in post-ordination courses. In any case there should be some expert priest in every diocese who should be ready to give advice as to courses of study and as to the wisest ways of dealing with individual cases. Generally speaking, we think that unless and until they have been carefully trained and licensed for the purpose, the younger clergy should not advise women and girls in regard to sexual matters, whether in confession or otherwise. We suggest that there should be in the different branches of our Communion councils of experts in these matters to whom the authorities in diocese or parish or college could have recourse.

### *The Family*

Of family life we would now speak, for it governs all that follows. To say that it is the indispensable basis of all healthy social life, indeed of civilisation itself, would be a platitude if it were not that this very fact is now called in question. The Church's age-long interest in the creation and preservation of family life is more than ever the concern of all her members;

first in marriage, then onwards in the children, through all the stages of childhood, youth, adolescence, and maturity. A vital condition of marriage is mutual love. This mutual love needs thoughtful cultivation, so that the whole personality of each partner, mind and spirit as well as body, becomes more completely involved as life goes on. The presence or absence of this tender and watchful consideration on the part of husband and wife, not least in the closest intimacies of married life, has often made or marred the union. For marriage is a vocation. There is that in God which can only be adequately reflected, so far as this world is concerned, in the perfect union of man and woman. Inseparable from this is the vocation to parenthood. Parenthood is not always possible, but the parental instinct can be "sublimated." Many childless couples are true fathers and mothers. There are many unmarried women whose help in family life and outside is beyond price. Where it is possible the duty and glory of parenthood is paramount. It gives food for awe as well as thought that in that most momentous action—the creation of a human soul—man and woman are in direct co-operation with God. This consideration alone should be sufficient to lift sex-life out of all unworthy associations of thought and action. So precious is the privilege of being alive that parents should give it to as many children as their circumstances permit, both for their own sakes—for character thrives on the discipline thereby involved—and for the children's sakes, for the same is true of family life.

In this connection, we think well to remind those who will read our words that the educational value of a considerable family far outweighs any advantages which may come from an expensive education. In all cases, parents should be on their guard lest considerations of economy should be used as an excuse for avoiding those conditions of simplicity and even hardness in home life which, in these days, are so unpalatable, but which can do so much to toughen the fibre of character.

## *Birth Control*

We now pass on to consider one of the most urgent and perplexing problems of our day, the decline of the birth-rate throughout the civilised world. This is largely due to the increasing use of methods which are deliberately adopted to limit the size of the family. We strongly denounce the practice of abortion which has as its aim the destruction of life which has already come into being. It is contrary to the law of God and of man. We have reason to know that the sale of drugs designed to procure abortion is large. These always are, we believe, harmful to the woman and also to the child if it survives.

Their use, like all other methods of abortion, is sinful and ought to be regarded with abhorrence by all right-minded people.

There is no doubt, however, that the diminution of the birth-rate in modern times by 50 per cent. is mainly due to the knowledge and use of methods which prevent conception. These methods are now widely used in every class of society. There are many who advocate them as the solution of social and personal problems, there are others who condemn them as sinful, there are many who are sorely perplexed as to the legitimacy of their use. We feel, therefore, bound to give troubled consciences some guidance on this matter.

It must be recognised that there is in the Catholic Church a very strong tradition that the use of preventive methods is in all cases unlawful for a Christian. We acknowledge the weight of that testimony, but we are unable to accept that tradition as necessarily final. It must be admitted that it is not founded on any directions given in the New Testament. It has not behind it the authority of any Œcumenical Council of the Church. Moreover, it is significant that the Communion which most strongly condemns in principle all preventive methods, nevertheless in practice recognises that there are occasions when a rigid insistence on the principle is impossible. If our own Communion is to give guidance on this problem, it must speak frankly and openly, with a full appreciation of facts and conditions which were not present in the past, but which are due to modern civilisation.

We are convinced that many of the results which have followed from the use of the discovery of more effective methods are very grave. They have encouraged illicit intercourse among the unmarried by removing the fear of consequences. They have been frequently used to avoid the responsibilities of parenthood and as a means of escaping from the self-control which should be exercised in married as well as in single life. They have become a danger to many civilized nations by a disproportionate reduction of their best stocks. We think that some of those who are most active in the advocacy of birth-control do not give sufficient weight to these considerations.

It will be admitted by all that there are circumstances in married life which justify, and even demand, the limitation of the family by *some* means. The Church is concerned with the moral principles which must govern all such limitation. There are certain principles which must always be axiomatic for Christians. These principles are to be discerned in loyalty to Christ, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, whose strength is sufficient for all human needs.

It is axiomatic that parenthood is for married people the foremost duty ; to evade or disregard that duty must always be wrong. It is equally axiomatic that the state of marriage is a divinely ordered relationship in which intercourse between man and woman calls for the highest exercise of the Christian virtues of self-discipline, self-control and self-sacrifice. There are multitudes of married people who have found in that mutual sacrifice a bond of deeper unity as well as an ever-increasing moral strength. It follows, therefore, that it can never be right to make pleasure or self-indulgence the motive for determining to limit or refuse parenthood. Equally it can never be right for intercourse to take place which might lead to conception, where a birth would involve grave danger to the health, even to the life, of the mother, or would inflict upon the child to be born a life of suffering ; or where the mother would be prematurely exhausted, and additional children would render her incapable of carrying out her duties to the existing family.

The primary and most obvious way of dealing with such circumstances as seem to make the limitation of parenthood obligatory is total abstinence from intercourse, even it may be for long periods. Such abstinence brings with it to those who claim and receive divine grace the opportunity for the highest exercise of Christian love and self-denial.

Yet there exist moral situations which may make it obligatory to use other methods. To a certain extent this obligation is affected by the advice of medical and scientific authority. But in all such cases, as in those where abstinence is the way chosen, the final decision must still be determined by reference to the spiritual ends for which marriage was ordained ; and the attainment of these still calls for the same exhibition of Christian self-discipline and virtue. Each couple must decide for themselves, as in the sight of God, after the most careful and conscientious thought, and, if perplexed in mind, after taking competent advice, both medical and spiritual.

In our judgment the question which they should put to themselves is this : Would conception be for any reason wrong ? If it would clearly be wrong, and if there is good moral reason why the way of abstinence should not be followed, we cannot condemn the use of scientific methods to prevent conception, which are thoughtfully and conscientiously adopted.

Other reasons are often urged for the use of such methods— circumstances of income, housing and education, are all advanced in justification. These need careful scrutiny. We are unable to accept conception control as the right solution of unsatisfactory social and economic conditions which ought to be changed by the influence of Christian public opinion.

Plainly we cannot provide a complete list of circumstances affording a good moral reason for avoiding conception. But as it seems to us the principle involved is this: Children are the primary end of the intercourse to which marriage leads. Married people do wrong when they refuse to have children whom they could train to serve God and add to the strength of the nation. But intercourse has also a secondary end within the natural sacrament of marriage. Where for any morally sound reason the first end is to be ruled out, it does not necessarily follow that the secondary end must be ruled out also, provided that self-control is exercised, and husband and wife have truly examined their consciences upon the matter.

In all these matters of sex, self-deception is all too easy. Let none forget that in this as in all relationships of life Christ calls to a heroism to which by His power His servants can attain.

### *Grave Evils of to-day and the Christian Remedy*

We come now to a very different matter. We have alluded to the sacramental nature of the sexual act within the married state. Herein, we believe lies the answer to some of our most perplexing problems; the problem, for instance, of the use of contraceptives outside the married state. It is obvious that this is one of the greatest evils of our time, and it is rife in the community. It has removed the fear of "consequences" from illicit intercourse, and has thus made easy every kind of irregular and temporary union. Some other and worthier motive than fear must be found if men and women are to "keep straight." It is found in the fundamental fact that if the sexual act in marriage has a sacramental value then its use outside marriage is sinful. It is separating the outward sign from the inward and spiritual union of marriage, and using it only for purposes of pleasure and self-indulgence. Those who have thus indulged themselves come to marriage with less than all to give, having established a relationship which parodies marriage without its responsibilities and safeguards. To secure a momentary satisfaction by appropriating the physical expression of the intimate and permanent union of mind and soul, which *ex-hypothesi* does not exist, is selfish and degrading. It numbs the spiritual faculty, and thereby tends to the atrophy of some of the finest instincts of our nature. There is dire loss of that white flower of purity which is one of life's most beautiful and most precious possessions. If the intimacy of heart and soul does exist, then marriage is the divinely provided outcome; if it does not, then the irregular union is an insult to manhood and its innate chivalry, and a degradation of womanhood, inasmuch as that sanctuary which ought only to be open in marriage has been desecrated.

In this light we must view "trial" or "companionate" marriage. That men and women should have ample opportunities for mutual knowledge before any binding decision is reached is obvious, and in our day at least such opportunities for comradeship are not usually lacking. But to include in such a "trial" the innermost intimacies of marriage itself is to prove lacking in those very qualities of reverence and discipline for both body and mind on which the happiness of married life so signally depends.

There is more in the matter than this. No course of action can be right for individuals which, if repeated and extended throughout society would cause grave damage, if not chaos. Furthermore, for a man and woman to give themselves to each other in sexual intercourse is to establish a relationship which, unless it is the outcome of mere lust, craves to be binding.

Particularly is this so on the woman's side, for with her such intercourse is the natural prelude or accompaniment to motherhood and home. If that sequence is broken at the outset it causes a moral and sometimes also a mental dislocation. Things can never be the same again, and there remains a profound dissatisfaction of heart and mind which cannot but leave an indelible mark on character. There is more in love than pleasure, and to take the physical act out of its context of lifelong loyalty the one to the other is to play fast and loose with duty to the community, and, still more, to defy that law of God by which His children's welfare is secured.

### *Preventive and Rescue Work*

Before closing this report we would call the attention of the Church to the vital importance of its Preventive and Rescue work. It aims at the re-making of lives and characters which have been damaged often through lack of the kind of instruction of which we have been speaking, and at the removal of the conditions which cause this damage. A great change has come over the whole climate of this enterprise in recent years. It is no longer lowering, lugubrious and negative: it is positive, hopeful and adventurous. And therefore it is far more efficient. Marked progress has been made in the study of the psychology of the child and the adolescent, and the training of the workers is carried out on the best lines both scientific and moral. Indeed, much greater emphasis is laid on the "preventive" side of the work It is widely felt that it is better to study the causes with a view to their elimination or modification than to concentrate on that "moral ambulance" work which till recent times, and in the main, has occupied the field. No words can adequately express the gratitude which the Church owes to those devoted women whose zeal, patience and perseverance have been and are the mainstay of the whole enterprise. But they deserve, and should have, more adequate support, both in money and service, and not least from the men of the Church. Not only can they help in matters financial and legal, but in personal service. It is obvious that men are involved in this evil as much as women, and in some of its aspects the help of men is essential if the cases are to be adequately dealt with. It may be that the time has come for some further experiments in this direction, but it is certain that the whole question of purity among men needs more careful attention in the Church at large. Before leaving this subject of "Prevention and Rescue" we would recognise the skilled services of the women police, and express the hope that they may be still more extensively used.

### *Conclusion*

We end as we began. A supreme interest of the Church is the creation, the maintenance, and, where needed, the restoration of family life. Round this high and holy trust are grouped the hopes and the problems to which we have called attention. Solutions will only come in response to the prayer, thought and courage with which the Church approaches them. There are, and there will be, differences of opinion as to ways and means. But behind it all and beyond it all lies our Lord's unchanging purpose of life, and more abundant life. In that bright surrounding we would place all our sex questions, sure that through the inspiration of His Spirit we shall be enabled, as we face them, to "think those things that be good," and "by His merciful guiding" to "perform the same."

### *Note on the Validity of certain Christian Marriages*

In the course of our deliberations on these matters, our attention has been drawn to the anxiety and disturbance of mind which have been caused to some members of our Communion, when the validity of the marriage of a member with a member of another Communion has been called in question, on the ground that it has been solemnised in one of our Churches. We think it right, therefore, to include the following statement in our report.

1. The essence of a valid marriage consists in the consent before witnesses of two parties, who are competent to marry, to live permanently one with another as man and wife.

2. When the conditions precedent to a valid marriage as laid down by the civil authority and such other like conditions

as are laid down by the ecclesiastical authority have been complied with, the Church solemnizes the marriage with prayers and blessings. The absence of such religious sanctions does not invalidate the marriage.

3. The Church of England and those Churches in communion with it recognise the validity of marriages which are celebrated by other Christian bodies than itself in which there is no diriment impediment between the two parties, and where the precedent conditions laid down by the civil authority have been complied with.

4. The denial of the validity of such marriages by any part of the Christian Church is a departure from the true tradition of the Catholic Church and is much to be deplored.

## (c) RACE

"One in Christ Jesus." So St. Paul expressed, for all Christians and for all time, the right relation of the races of men. By this we must stand, and for this we must labour if we are to be loyal followers of a Master Who came to redeem a world. We are sons in the family of a common Father and brethren in the love of one Saviour.

### *Causes of the Present Unrest*

The tide of race consciousness and national feeling is flowing deep and strong, and is a fundamental cause of the present unrest. Mysterious undercurrents of vague aspiration are felt throughout the world. Ambitions, both personal and national, confuse the issues. New situations have arisen which cause much perplexity, and in the efforts towards solution of difficulties some have encountered bitterness where they had expected grateful understanding; others have been met with repression where they looked for co-operation and advance. In recent years the world in which we live has been growing rapidly smaller. Improved means of transport and communication have broken through the barriers of the ages. We send messages across the world more rapidly than our fathers could send them across the Thames. Knowledge of events is widespread, and has often intensified race feeling by revealing to isolated races world conditions and racial aspirations hitherto unknown. Communication and contact will not in themselves solve the problem; upon occasion they may only intensify it.

It must be remembered also that with these closer relations there has come an increase of economic pressure. The dominant races have sometimes seized the opportunity for exploitation; or again, they are fearing loss of power and prestige by the emergence and rivalry of races which they have counted as inferior, but which are now determined to win a fair share of the good things of life.

The clash of interests is naturally most marked in countries where men of different races and civilisation live permanently together. The resulting unrest has its roots largely in social causes, such as the fear of race admixture and the demand that standards of living which have obtained among the more favoured races shall not be lowered.

Where one of the races involved is exercising rulership over another race which is resident in its own land, the problem is intensified. However sincere and unselfish may be the purpose of the ruling race, and however fully it may recognise itself as a trustee and not an owner, there is inevitably an uncertainty as to the time when this trusteeship should pass into partnership. Only the utmost wisdom and patience on the part of each of the races concerned can prevent serious and sometimes disastrous misunderstanding and conflict.

But perhaps the greatest single obstacle to racial understanding and co-operation is to be found in the so-called "superiority complex" of the dominant races, and especially of the Anglo-Saxon, and the consequent suspicion and sensitiveness which this has engendered in other races. Too frequently our keen appreciation of our own virtues and abilities leads us to feel that any who differ from us in race, colour or language are thereby inferior. We are prepared to patronise civilisations far older than our own, and to ignore cultures which we do not understand. Most of these conflicts would pass into cordial co-operation, if we could remember to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

### *The Christian Attitude Towards the Problem*

It is the Church's business to bring men's minds back to the New Testament where we find in Christ the full revelation of the Fatherhood of God and that the Church is a Kingdom in which all are citizens, a Body in which each member has a share in the life of the whole.

From this doctrine of the unity of all Christians in Christ two principles emerge :—

(*a*) Spiritual oneness in Christ. If all baptised persons were loyal to Christ, their Head, most of the causes of racial bitterness would disappear because they would recognise that "whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it, or one member is honoured all the members rejoice with it "[1] St. Paul teaches us that in Christ " there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all."[2]

Unfortunately the economic pressure of modern life is so severe that most people, even though they profess and call themselves Christians, have grown accustomed to live their lives in compartments and to resent the intrusion of religion into politics or business or ordinary social relationships. But the task of the Church is to multiply the number of persons whose relations with their fellows are governed by respect and reverence for the individuality of others because they have learned to see them in relation to the purpose of God.

In pursuit of spiritual oneness it is impossible to ignore the part played by education. Without it no individual can hope to make his full contribution to the highest welfare of the group. This education must concern itself with the whole man, and the creation of character, which involves the enlistment of religion as the basis of morality. We would appeal for a full recognition of the fact that the morality of the Christian religion is the only sound basis for life and that in Christ alone is found the power which makes the highest achievement possible.

(*b*) The second principle that emerges from the doctrine of the body of Christ is Interdependence. We are all members in one body " and the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee. . . . . Nay, much rather those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary."[3]

History teaches that no civilisation has survived on a serf basis. The interests of the various sections of the community are one and indivisible. Therefore, any attempt to govern in the interests of a section or of the people of one colour, must in the end lead to disaster ; the more discontent is driven underground the greater one day will be the explosion. Our task is to convince the world that co-operation as taught in the New Testament is not only sound Christianity, but sound political science and social economy.

### *Some Principles Involved*

Political science recognises that every man has, by the mere fact of his birth, the right to be regarded and to be treated as a human being ; the religion of Christ gives him the further franchise of a child of God. Whatever may be his position in the social scale, whatever his colour, he ought to be given the opportunity to claim that franchise, and by education, training and development be encouraged to rise in the cultural scale and to develop his powers to their utmost capacity. In this effort toward self-improvement the weaker races need the sympathy and the loving care of their stronger brethren, and because of this need the stronger races ought to recognise their obligation and their privilege to help the weaker and to train them to take their place as an integral part of the community. Nor is it true that only the backward races benefit by this co-operation of the weak and the strong; no race is so poor but that it has something of value to contribute towards the enrichment and perfection of the whole family of God.

---

[1] I Cor. XII 26.

[2] Col. III 11. R.V.

[3] I Cor XII 21–22.

We believe that if the great principles of spiritual oneness and interdependence are applied, the Church will become the most powerful of all influences making for the transcending of national and racial differences in a wider fellowship.

The way will be opened for all nations to bring their treasures to Christ, so that together we may " grow up in all things into him, which is the head, from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."[1]

Modern progress has made the world a neighbourhood; God has given us the task of making it a brotherhood.

### (*d*) PEACE AND WAR

War, as a method of settling international disputes, is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ. We believe that as the Christian conscience has condemned infanticide and slavery and torture, it is now called to condemn war as an outrage on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of all mankind. We do not deny the right of a nation to defend itself if attacked, or to resort to force in fulfilment of international obligations, but it is the duty of the Christian Church to create a world-wide public opinion which will condemn a nation that resorts to war from a motive of self-interest or a mistaken conception of honour as guilty of a crime against humanity.

### *The Progress of International Goodwill*, 1920–30

At the time of the last Lambeth Conference, the world was suffering from the exhaustion and disillusionment of the Great War. The League of Nations was " painfully struggling into life," and it seemed as though only a miracle could save mankind from " another and even more hideous war." We thank God that to-day we can speak of the outlook in much more hopeful terms. The League of Nations has now become an indispensable organ of international co-operation, and has successfully dealt with several crises that menaced the peace of the world. By the Kellogg-Briand Pact, 58 of the nations of the world have renounced war as an instrument of national policy, and by the ratification of the " Optional Clause," most of them have agreed to submit all disputes, with few reservations, to arbitration. The organisation of the World Court, the admission of Germany to the League of Nations, the final evacuation of German territory, the settlement of the Reparations question and the agreement for the limitation of Naval Armaments, are among the events of recent years that justify the hope that the world is being guided into the way of peace.

---

[1] Eph. IV. 15–16.

We note also with thankfulness that the spirit of hatred is giving place to a kindlier spirit among the peoples of the world. The younger generation everywhere is thinking in terms of co-operation and friendly emulation, and is finding in science, in athletics and in other common interests new bonds of union. Into this new spirit of co-operation the Christian Church must throw the whole force of its influence. We must enlist patriotism on the side of peace. This we can do more effectively because the renunciation of the right to resort to war has created a new situation. No nation can, without shame and dishonour, treat its adherence to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, or its pledge to submit all disputes to arbitration, as a "scrap of paper." The highest patriotism may rightly be concerned with its country's honour in this respect, and make every effort to ensure that it remains true to its plighted word. It is on public opinion that statesmen must depend, and the Christian Church, as the trustee of the peace of the world, must guard with constant vigilance against any slackening of the will to peace, and call into co-operation for this purpose all the forces of moral idealism that are available outside its borders.

The Christian Church can make no terms with the idea expressed in the phrase " My country, right or wrong." Great as is the debt of service that a man owes to his Fatherland, the claim of Christ remains supreme, and the State can only demand the wholehearted loyalty of its citizens when its action is guided by the same moral principles as the private citizen is taught to apply in his relations with his neighbours. The Machiavellian doctrine of the non-moral character of the State, to which Bolshevism is committed, is contrary to the whole Christian ideal. If the Christian Church in every nation could refuse to countenance or support a declaration of war by its own government unless that government had inaugurated or accepted a bona fide offer to submit the dispute to arbitration, it would be doing no more than insisting on the fulfilment of pledges solemnly made.

We do not claim that the Christian Churches have done all that they might have done to build up securities for world peace. But while we confess that a large number of Christian men and women have been indifferent to or distrustful of the efforts of the statesmen of the world to promote international peace, we believe that the motive-power of these efforts has been the Christian ideal, and we thankfully recognise the support that many of the leaders of the Churches have given to the cause. Our greatest need now is the spread of a passionate aspiration for peace and goodwill among all Christian people.

### *The Causes of War*

If we are to combat the war-spirit, we must try to attack it at its source. The real causes of any war lie further back than the particular dispute or incident that sets a spark to the inflammable material that has often been accumulating for years. Among the causes of war three seem to us of special importance.

The first of these is the inflamed and aggressive Nationalism that ignores the rights of other nations in the determination to assert its own. Nations exist by the Will of God as expressed in history. They exist not for self-aggrandisement, but for service, and their true honour lies not in the extent to which they can impose their yoke on other nations, but on the value of their contribution to the moral and spiritual ideals of the world.

Closely connected with Nationalism is the problem of the rights of minorities, which constitutes a disturbing element in post-war Europe. These minorities often differ ecclesiastically as well as racially from the predominant national majority, and a more generous attitude of the Christian Churches towards one another would do much to assuage the bitterness that almost inevitably results from differences of language, custom and racial allegiance. No re-adjustment of frontiers will by itself solve the problem, as it is impossible to draw frontier-lines in which no aliens are included.

The second—and perhaps the most potent—cause of wars is the fear that is the outcome of distrust. Before the war the nations of Europe were hag-ridden by this distrust of one another, and sought security in the piling up of armaments till the crash came. We must convince the peoples of the world that the risk involved in trusting one another is far less grave than the inevitable consequences of mutual distrust. In this a great responsibility rests upon the Press. If the energy devoted by some organs of the Press in all countries to sowing the seeds of distrust were devoted to the strengthening of the spirit of mutual confidence, all the newspapers of the world might exercise, as some of them do now, a powerful influence on the side of peace.

The most remarkable illustration of the value of mutual trust is afforded by the undefended frontier of nearly four thousand miles between the United States and Canada. The great statue of Christ on the summit of the Andes is also a witness to the determination of two nations—Chili and the Argentine—to take the risk of trusting each other.

A third possible cause of war lies in economic competition, and specially in the competition for the control of the raw materials of industry. Commerce ought to be, and often is, a bond of union between nations, but unrestricted competition, especially when it involves the exploitation of weaker peoples, may be a cause of war. One corrective of this danger lies in the recognition of the economic interdependence of nations in the modern world—a subject so important that we shall deal with it more fully in a later section of this report. But such economic interdependence will never by itself prevent war. Only a spiritual renaissance can ensure the peace of the world.

### *Organisations and Influences making for International Peace*

The first and greatest political organisation for promoting world peace is the League of Nations. The purpose of the League is not only to avert war by dealing with disputes between nations as they arise, but also to foster the habit of co-operation among the nations of the world. It deals with International Health problems, with the "White Slave" traffic, with the traffic in deleterious drugs, with the protection of children and the suppression of slavery. It has provided for the repatriation of war prisoners and refugees, supervised the financial reorganisation of Austria and Hungary, and organised the Permanent World Court of Justice, which is now accepted by 52 States as an arbitral court for the settlement of international problems. Its International Labour Organisation aims at stabilising labour conditions throughout the world, and so protecting the workers from having their standards of life undermined by the competition of underpaid labour.

This brief summary serves to demonstrate how far-reaching is the work of the League. It has shown how powerful a sanction the moral judgment of an assembly representing most of the nations of the world already provides. But its effective influence depends on the extent to which the intelligent enthusiasm of the peoples of the world can be enlisted in its support, and the League of Nations Union, and kindred organisations among other nations, are doing valuable work in supplying information and enrolling supporters. In a Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral last year, the Archbishop of Canterbury appealed to all members of the Church of England to give their support to the League. "I am persuaded," he said, "that the principles of the League of Nations are in accord with the Spirit of Christ. If this be true, then it is upon the citizens who bear the name of Christ that the duty of standing by and behind the League of Nations is most clearly laid. . . . With whatever authority belongs to the office which I hold, I would call upon all my fellow-Churchmen to be foremost in their support of the League of Nations, and of the Union which in this country exists to strengthen its cause."

We are assured by the American Bishops on our Committee that they gladly recognise the principle embodied in a League of Nations as contributing to the peace of the world, and that they believe that the sympathetic interest of their nation in the League is growing, and that the absence of official recognition is no evidence of America's aloofness from or indifference to those problems with which the League has to deal. We recognise with thankfulness that by the initiation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and by increasing co-operation with the League, the United States is showing its deep sympathy with the things that make for peace.

Though the League of Nations Union derives its strength mainly from the support of the Christian Churches, it is not a distinctively religious society. The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, which was founded on the eve of the outbreak of the Great War, aims at mobilising the Christian forces of the world in the cause of international goodwill. It has already National Councils in 31 countries, and draws together representatives of the Christian Communions for conference and fellowship. We desire earnestly to commend the work of the World Alliance to the support of our fellow Churchmen. With more adequate resources it could do much more than it is able to do now in promoting that world-wide Christian fellowship, the lack of which has in the past rendered the Christian Church ineffective in the sphere of international relationships.

The Continuation Committee of the Stockholm Conference, while not directly dealing with peace questions, is helping to bring representatives of the nations into friendly co-operation for common purposes of human welfare. We welcome all gatherings like those held at Stockholm, Lausanne and Jerusalem, in which representatives of different Christian Communions are brought together in conference on aspects of Christian faith and service. We hope that these efforts may lead to some kind of permanent association of all the Christian Churches that may become the spiritual counterpart of the League of Nations. Many other international associations have grown up in recent years, and we believe that they constitute a valuable asset for goodwill among the peoples of the world. Isolation breeds misunderstanding; and closer contact between men of different nations is the best corrective of this danger.

### *Disarmament*

The British Foreign Secretary recently asserted that disarmament was the acid test of the sincerity of the allegiance of the nations to the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Unquestionably, the nations of the world are spending on armaments a sum far in excess of the minimum that we recognise to be necessary for the effective policing of the world. Only impracticable idealism would advocate such complete disarmament as would leave the civilised world unprotected. But the Christian Church is bound to work for an increasing process of disarmament, as the nations grow accustomed to the settlement of disputes by other means than war. Such means are now available. The growing tendency to provide in international treaties and conventions for the reference of disputes to the Permanent Court of International Justice is an encouraging evidence of a new spirit of goodwill in international relationships. In many of these treaties provision is made for conciliation, arbitration and direct judicial settlement by the Permanent Court. "There is a distinct movement to specify the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court as that to which legal disputes are to be submitted." There are already nearly 300 Treaties and Agreements in existence that provide for the reference of cases of dispute to the Court, and their number is constantly growing. National pride, the fear of unemployment, the influence of vested interests, dangers of internal disturbance, and the desire to maintain, or to change, the existing territorial system, all play their part in hindering any large measure of international disarmament. But we believe that "the proper impulse has been given," and that by its patient and courageous support of all well-considered proposals for the limitation of armaments by international agreement, the Church may render effective service to the cause of world peace. The difficulties in the way are a call, not for despair, but for faith and perseverance.

### *Reactions of International Trade and Industry*

In an earlier section of this report we have referred to economic difficulties as among the causes of war. We have also alluded to the efforts of the League of Nations to promote peace by giving close attention to the solution of these difficulties. The whole subject of the international aspects of trade and industry is so important that it needs further consideration.

In estimating the causes of past conflicts some historians have probably attached undue importance to economic conditions of a purely material kind. But it is unquestionable that the war spirit is engendered by selfishness and greed in industrial and economic relationships ; while the increased strain of modern industry and the contrast between excessive wealth and poverty tend to foster a spirit of unrest which reacts on the international situation.

Two resolutions of the last Lambeth Conference admirably sum up the situation :—

(73) "We desire to emphasise our conviction that the pursuit of mere self-interest, whether individual or corporate, will never bring healing to the wounds of society. This conviction is at once exemplified and reinforced by what has happened in and since the War. Nor is this less true when that self-interest is equipped with every advantage of science and education. Our only hope lies in reverent allegiance to the Person of Christ, whose Law is the Law of Love, in acceptance of His principles, and reliance on His power."

(74) "An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private or sectional advantage. . . ."

The truth is that where there is peace at home there is a better prospect of peace abroad ; for whether at home or abroad peace is founded on truth, justice and goodwill. We gladly recognise an improved relationship between the different classes engaged in industry, and a better realisation of the meaning of co-operation in service, but we cannot say that society has even yet come to believe that industry exists for man, not man for industry.

One fact is clear. The whole subject is international in its scope. Economic unrest in any part of the world affects the whole. The last ten years have shown the strength and complexity of the bonds (social, economic, industrial) which unite the nations one with another. Such close relationships ought to make for peace; but spiritual influence has not kept pace with material progress. The industrialism of the West has permeated the East, and while we in western lands are slowly—too slowly—throwing off "the sickness of an acquisitive society," we have infected India, China and Japan with a disease which is dangerous not less to international peace than to national well-being. Moreover, the evidence of the late Mr. Grimshaw at the Jerusalem Conference showed that pitiless economic exploitation of weaker races is by no means a thing of the past.

The international implications of the most serious economic problem of our time—unemployment—are equally manifest. It is not the business of the Christian Church to suggest technical remedies. But it is our duty to rouse dull consciences and to turn the attention of all Christian people to the moral background of the picture. It is a strange paradox that the capacity of the world to produce more than it needs of almost everything should co-exist with extreme poverty in large areas of population, and the "discordance between consuming and producing power" call for hard thinking and courageous action.

Such thought and action must be international in character. The Christian Social Institute at Geneva, a practical outcome of the Life and Work Conference at Stockholm in 1925, is one of the agencies which is pursuing careful research, and there is good promise for the future in the attempt made by the International Labour Office at the "Coal Conference" to estimate the world's needs and the share which each nation should take in supplying them.

Again, the crucial problem of finance is international. Without entering into difficult technical considerations the Church may rightly urge that the solution of this and kindred problems involves human, social and spiritual issues. In view of this fact the Church is bound to claim the right to be heard, and cannot accept the contention that these questions lie outside its province. If we really believe that Christ came that all may have life and may have it abundantly, we must be ready for study, for work and for sacrifice in order that in our industrial system and our economic structure, as well as in our homes and Churches, His Kingdom may come and His will may be done; for "in His will is our Peace."

### *The True Idea of Peace*

The idea of peace seems dull and uninspiring when it is so presented as to mean little more than the maintenance of the existing order and concentration on material well-being. War has called into exercise some of the noblest qualities of our nature, by its demand for sacrifice, endurance, and co-operation for unselfish ends. Unless we can show that peace affords at least equal scope for these, we shall not succeed in evoking passionate enthusiasm for international peace. We must present an ideal of peace that is not static but dynamic; we must show that, if "peace hath her victories, not less renowned than war," those victories are only won by effort and sacrifice. The call of the Cross is not a call to ease and security but to conflict, danger, self-discipline and self-sacrifice. To nations, not less than to individuals, peace offers the alternative of ignoble self-indulgence or high tasks of service. War is a waste of material and spiritual resources that might be used in a nobler war against all that degrades and debases human life. Our own Church consecrates her children from their infancy to lifelong soldiership under the banner of Christ. The Church is called to lead humanity in war against disease, ignorance, sloth, self-indulgence and every evil thing that infests God's world. In the consecration of men and nations to this war lies the true secret of fellowship, for men are drawn together less by direct effort than by sufferings endured and achievements won in the service of a common cause that they love more dearly than they love themselves. If we could make men hear the call of Christ as clearly as they heard the call of their country in the Great War, they would find the way of peace in the fellowship of a common service.

### *The Task of the Church*

As the Body of Christ, the Church is super-national; its task is to consecrate national life, but it is false to its mission when it identifies itself with the claim of any nation to self-aggrandisement and disregard of the rights of other nations. God is no respecter of persons, or of nations; his fatherly love goes out impartially to all His children; and loyalty to our own country must be subordinate to the larger loyalty that we owe to the whole human race for whom Christ died.

Every Christian man is called to witness to this truth, and to face, if need be, the cost of his witness. Our prayers for peace must always be associated with the prayer "Renew a right spirit within me." Side by side with the building up of safeguards for international peace, we are called to work for the transformation of human character that will inspire a passionate hatred of injustice and falsehood and a passionate devotion to the living Christ.

We are often told that we cannot change human nature. If that were true, Christianity would be founded on a delusion, for the purpose of Christ's redemption is to bring to men a new heart and a right spirit. We are told that the Church has in the past never condemned war, and has therefore forfeited its right to pose to-day as the champion of peace. We are not called upon to judge our fathers, but we are called to follow the right as we see it, and if God, the Great Educator, has revealed more clearly to this generation the fundamental inconsistency between war and the fact of His Fatherhood, the more tremendous is our responsibility for witnessing to this truth. We dare not be disobedient to the heavenly vision of a world set free from the menace of war, or shrink from any effort or sacrifice that will make that vision a reality.

(Signed) THEODORE WINTON: *Chairman*

## NOTE

### RESOLUTIONS 73–80 OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE, 1920

### *Social and Industrial Questions*

73. We desire to emphasize our conviction that the pursuit of mere self-interest, whether individual or corporate, will never bring healing to the wounds of Society. This conviction is at once exemplified and reinforced by what has happened in and since the War. Nor is this less true when that self-interest is equipped with every advantage of science and education. Our only hope lies in reverent allegiance to the Person of Christ, whose Law is the Law of Love, in acceptance of His principles, and reliance on His power.

74. An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private or sectional advantage. All Christian people ought to take an active part in bringing about this change, by which alone we can hope to remove class dissensions and resolve industrial discords.

75. The Church cannot in its corporate capacity be an advocate or partisan, " a judge or a divider," in political or class disputes where moral issues are not at stake : nevertheless, even in matters of economic and political controversy, the Church is bound to give its positive and active corporate witness to the Christian principles of justice, brotherhood, and the equal and infinite value of every human personality.

76. In obedience to Christ's teaching as to covetousness and self-seeking, the Conference calls upon all members of His Church to be foremost both by personal action and sacrifice in maintaining the superiority of the claims of human life to those of

property. To this end it would emphasize the duty which is laid upon all Christians of setting human values above dividends and profits in their conduct of business, of avoiding extravagance and waste, and of upholding a high standard of honour and thoroughness in work. In a word, they must set an example in subordinating the claim for rights to the call of duty.

77. Members of the Church are bound to take an active part, by public action and by personal service, in removing those abuses which depress and impoverish human life. In company with other citizens and organisations they should work for reform, and particularly for such measures as will secure the better care of children: including real opportunity for an adequate education; protection of the workers against unemployment; and the provision of healthy homes.

78. The Church is bound to use its influence to remove inhuman or oppressive conditions of labour in all parts of the world, especially among the weaker races, and to give its full support to those clauses in the League of Nations Covenant which aim at raising by international agreement the status of industrial workers in all countries.

79. The conference notes with deep interest the prohibition by the will of the people of the sale and manufacture of intoxicating drinks in the Republic of the United States of America, and of their sale in most of the Provinces of Canada, and commends this action to the earnest and sympathetic attention of the Christian Church throughout the world. The Conference urges members of the Church in other countries—

(1) To support such legislation as will lead to a speedy reduction in the use of intoxicants;

(2) To recognise the duty of combating the evil of intemperance by personal example and willing self-sacrifice.

80. If the Church is to witness without reproach for justice and brotherhood in the world, it must show itself serious and insistent in reforming abuses within its own organization, and in promoting brotherhood among its own members. Further, if Christian witness is to be fully effective, it must be borne by nothing short of the whole body of Christian people.

## No. III

# THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

*The Committee*† *appointed a sub-committee to deal with the relations of the Anglican Communion to Episcopal Churches, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Gloucester, while the full committee dealt with the question as it affects the Non-Episcopal Churches. But the whole Committee has accepted the whole Report for presentation to the Conference.*

---

† Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Albany.*
Bishop of Algoma.
Bishop of Argentina.
Bishop of Atlanta. (*a*)
Bishop of Ballarat.
Bishop Baynes.
Bishop of Bradford.
Bishop of Brechin.
Bishop of Bristol.
Bishop of British Honduras.
Bishop Bury.
Bishop of Calcutta.
Bishop of Calgary.
Bishop of California (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Chekiang.
Bishop of Chichester (*a*) (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Clogher.
Bishop of Colombo.
Bishop Craig Stewart. (*a*)
Bishop of Croydon.
Bishop of Dornakal.
Bishop of Down.
Archbishop of Dublin. (*a*)
Bishop of Durham.
Bishop of Eau Claire.
Bishop in Egypt and Sudan. (*a*)
Bishop in Fuhkien.
Bishop of Fulham (*a*) (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Gibraltar. (*a*)
Bishop of Gippsland.
Bishop of Gloucester (*a*) (*Chairman of sub-committee*).
Bishop of Guiana.
Bishop of Guildford. (*a*)
Bishop Heywood.
Bishop of Hokkaido.
Bishop in Jerusalem.
Bishop of Kootenay.
Bishop of Lagos.*
Bishop of Leicester.
Bishop of Limerick.
Bishop of Madras.
Bishop of Mombasa.
Bishop of Monmouth.
Bishop of Montreal. (*a*)
Bishop of Moosonee.
Bishop Nash.
Bishop of Nassau. (*a*)
Archbishop of New Westminster.
Archbishop of New Zealand
Bishop of Northern Indiana. (*a*)
Bishop of Northern Rhodesia.
Bishop Palmer.
Bishop in Persia.
Bishop of Pretoria.
Bishop of Qu'Appelle.
Bishop of Rangoon.
Bishop of Rhode Island (*a*) (*Vice-Chairman*).
Bishop of Ripon
Bishop Rogers.
Bishop of San Joaquin.
Bishop in Shantung.
Bishop in South Japan.
Bishop Taitt.*
Bishop of Tennessee.*
Bishop Lindel Tsen.
Bishop of Wangaratta.
Bishop of Warrington.
Archbishop of West Indies.
Bishop of Western Michigan. (*a*)
Bishop of Western New York.
Bishop Wood.
Archbishop of York (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Zululand.

(*a*) Members of the sub-committee on relation to Episcopal Churches.

## PART I

We are deeply convinced that the unity of the Church is the will of God; and we rejoice in the signs of a growing movement towards unity among Christian people generally. Such signs are apparent in all parts of the world in unions recently accomplished or in definite movements towards union now in progress. Since the issue of the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 the World Conference on Faith and Order, first projected by our American brethren of the Anglican Communion, has been held at Lausanne, and registered a very large measure of agreement, while also clearly defining many points of difference for further consideration.

We recognize in this movement towards unity a two-fold impulse. First and deepest is loyalty to Our Lord; for the Church is His Body, and its divisions must needs be contrary to His will and hindrances to the fulfilment of His purpose. Second, and not essentially different, is the perception that only a united Church can be the means of bringing to Christ and to unity in Him a world torn by divisions economic, social, national and racial.

We here repeat, as the expressions of our own solemn conviction, the following paragraphs of that Appeal to all Christian People issued by the last Lambeth Conference in 1920 :—

> We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body. We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to associate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the divisions of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church.
>
> I. We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.
>
> II. This united fellowship is not visible in the world to-day. On the one hand there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West, to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. On the other hand there are the great Non-Episcopal Communions,

standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected. With them we are closely linked by many affinities, racial, historical and spiritual. We cherish the earnest hope that all these Communions, and our own, may be led by the Spirit into the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. But in fact we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship, and tending to live its own life apart from the rest.

III. The causes of division lie deep in the past, and are by no means simple or wholly blameworthy. Yet none can doubt that self-will, ambition, and lack of charity among Christians have been principal factors in the mingled process, and that these, together with blindness to the sin of disunion, are still mainly responsible for the breaches of Christendom. We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.

IV. The times call us to a new outlook and new measures. The Faith cannot be adequately apprehended and the battle of the Kingdom cannot be worthily fought while the body is divided, and is thus unable to grow up into the fulness of the life of Christ. The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church. The removal of the barriers which have arisen between them will only be brought about by a new comradeship of those whose faces are definitely set this way.

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians," within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled.

We desire especially to emphasize two points in the words just quoted. As Anglican Churchmen we make our own the confession of a share of the guilt for disunion. We believe that only when all can unite in penitence for their own share of responsibility and that of their fathers for the state of separation between Christians which has so grievously enfeebled the Church, is there hope of union also in a re-constituted fellowship.

With this penitence there must be combined the humility in which each Church is willing for a change of mind in regard to its customary teaching in one respect or another. If these customary teachings are to be combined in the united Church they will inevitably be to some extent re-shaped in the process. But the humility required must go further; it must lead to a readiness on the part of each Church to admit that in some respects it may have been wrong. If Churches fear for their own repute as they seek reunion, they cannot have enough contrition or humility to obtain it.

But, secondly, we recognize that during the period of division each of the bodies thus separated has under the guidance of the Holy Spirit developed spiritual resources and enjoyed spiritual treasures which must be conserved in the re-united Church, for they are the gift of Christ given to each in its own measure. We must not, for the sake of union, barter away our special heritage, for we hold it in trust for the whole Body of Christ; and we recognize also that those with whom we seek to be in fuller unity must equally safeguard the special treasures of their own tradition.

Our consciousness of the injury to the Church's life resulting from our divisions inspires the hope that through the restoration of union there will come an increase of spiritual life, and that the attainment of further fellowship through union must both enrich each uniting Church by bringing to it a fuller share in the gifts of others, and also enhance and sanctify the gifts brought by each to the common life.

There is abundant reason for those who cherish this hope to feel thankful and encouraged. In the gatherings where leaders of the Christian churches have come together to ascertain the measure of their agreement and the nature of their differences, there has been found a most striking and impressive measure of agreement with reference to the essentials of the Christian Faith. In the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne it was noticeable with what marked cordiality the whole Conference welcomed the Report on "The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel"; and it is to be remembered that in the Declaration made on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church, explaining why the Orthodox Delegation could not be parties to the reception of other Reports, this Report on the Church's Message is expressly accepted. It is a matter of no small importance that the delegates of all the Churches represented in that Conference should have agreed with enthusiasm upon the message which the Church is commissioned to deliver to the world.

The same agreement was found to exist between the representatives of the Church of England and of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, who met in conference at Lambeth Palace as a result of the Lambeth Appeal between 1921 and 1925. It is upon the basis of this unanimity with regard to the Gospel Message that we are encouraged to go forward in the search for full organic union.

In some directions, as will appear, we regretfully find ourselves unable to agree in recommending such reciprocal advances as many of our fellow Christians in other communions would welcome. In particular we cannot enter into any scheme of federation, involving interchangeability of ministries, while differences on points of order that we think essential still remain, for this would seem to us both to encourage and to express an acquiescence in essential dis-union. But recognizing the unity of Christian faith and experience which so many who are still divided in Church Order enjoy, and remembering the weakness of our divided Christian witness in face of a largely pagan world, we would urge the appropriateness and importance of united efforts to preach our one Gospel to those who are outside the membership of all organized communions. Such joint evangelism, wisely planned and carried out under due authority may not only be effective in converting power ; it may also at once proclaim and strengthen existing spiritual fellowship, and help to pave the way towards that corporate unity in which alone our witness can be fully effective, and our fellowship completely expressed.

But while urging such co-operative action we must here give our chief attention to the difficulties which confront us as we face the task of bringing together in one organic unity the varied inheritance of spiritual treasure enjoyed by the several communions now separated from one another.

It is no part of our duty to specify what will be the contributions of others to the common life of the united Church. But we may reasonably be asked to say what we conceive to be our own. Our special character and, as we believe, our peculiar contribution to the Universal Church, arises from the fact that, owing to historic circumstances, we have been enabled to combine in our one fellowship the traditional Faith and Order of the Catholic Church with that immediacy of approach to God through Christ to which the Evangelical Churches especially bear witness, and freedom of intellectual enquiry, whereby the correlation of the Christian revelation and advancing knowledge is constantly effected. This very combination makes difficult the manifestation of our real unity, and sometimes creates an impression of vagueness and indecisiveness which others are able to avoid. Yet we believe that such difficulties are incidental to that mode of corporate life which, as we are persuaded, most facilitates the search for truth, and best responds to and most adequately exhibits the diverse operations of the one Spirit.

But it is our maintenance of the traditional Faith and Order which chiefly concerns us here, because the problem confronting those who work for the restoration of union is primarily one of Faith and Order. Appreciation of spiritual devotion affords ground for desiring re-union, but agreement upon Faith and Order is the essential matter, in the sense that to secure a common Faith and Order is in itself to accomplish re-union. Previous Lambeth Conferences have approved, as the Anglican basis for negotiations with a view to re-union, the four points sometimes referred to as the Lambeth Quadrilateral; the Scriptures; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion: and the Historic Episcopate.

Of these the last appeared in the Lambeth Appeal as the one means of providing the "ministry acknowledged by every part of the the Church" which is, in the Appeal, the fourth point declared to be involved in the visible unity of the Church.

Among the Churches with which we have held Conference, we find that in the Episcopal Churches these four points are all secured; in the Non-Episcopal Churches we find that as regards three of the four points there is such a measure of agreement as to form a hopeful basis of further negotiation; these are the Canon of Scripture, the Faith as set forth and safeguarded by the Creeds, and the use of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. The outstanding point is the Historic Episcopate, and on this we desire to offer some further explication.

When we speak of the Historic Episcopate, we mean the Episcopate as it emerged in the clear light of history from the time when definite evidence begins to be available. It is, indeed, well known that the origin of episcopacy has been much debated. Without entering into the discussion of theories which divide scholars, we may affirm shortly that we see no reason to doubt the statement made in the Preface to our Ordinal that "from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons." Whatever variety of system may have existed in addition in the earlier age, it is universally agreed that by the end of the second century episcopacy had no effective rival. Among all the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries the episcopal ministry was never a subject of dispute. We may therefore reasonably claim that it is "historic" in a sense in which no other now can ever be. The Episcopate occupies a position which is, in point of historic development, analogous to that of the Canon of Scripture and of the Creeds. In the first days there was no Canon of New Testament Scripture, for the books afterwards included in it were still being written. For a time different Churches had different writings which they regarded as authoritative. The Canon was slowly formed, and the acceptance of a single Canon throughout the Church took several generations. So, too, the Apostles' Creed is the result of a process of growth which we can in large measure trace. If the Episcopate, as we find it established universally by the end of the second century, was the result of a like process of adaptation and growth in the organism of the Church, that would be no evidence that it lacked divine authority, but rather that the life of the Spirit within the Church had found it to be the most appropriate organ for the functions which it discharged.

In the course of time the Episcopate was greatly affected by secular forces, which bent it to many purposes alien to its true character, and went far to obscure its spiritual purpose. It is hard to recognise the successors of the Apostles in the feudal Prelates of the mediæval Church, or in the "peers spiritual" of eighteenth century England. Moreover, the essential character of the Episcopate was distorted by the development of the Papal Supremacy. Such deviations from its true principle are mainly responsible for the general abandonment of Episcopacy by the Protestant Churches. The Historic Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry.

For it is not a mere fact, but an institution fulfilling certain purposes. As an institution it was, and is, characterised by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. And it had generally recognised functions: the general superintendence of the Church and more especially of the Clergy; the maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist; the ordination of men to the ministry; the safeguarding of the faith; and the administration of the discipline of the Church. There have been different interpretations of the relation of these elements in the Historic Episcopate to one another; but the elements themselves are constant. When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions. What we uphold is the Episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration, as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times, and discharging those functions which from the earliest times it has discharged.

We readily agree that there are other elements in the full life of the Church, and we hold that the episcopate should be "constitutional" in the sense that provision should be made for the due co-operation of the presbyterate and the congregation of Christ's faithful people in the ordering of the Church's life. Indeed, this is already secured in varying degrees in all parts of the Anglican Communion by the revival of Diocesan and Provincial Synods, or by other similar means. We recognise that in this respect we have much to learn and to gain from the traditions and customs of the non-episcopal Churches. But our special responsibility as an episcopal Church is to bring into the complete life of the united Church those elements which we have received and hold in trust. Chief among these, in the matter of Order, is the Historic Episcopate.

In laying this emphasis on our own inheritance, we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-episcopal communions. On the contrary, we re-iterate the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, that "these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." But when we consider the problem which must be paramount in all our discussions, namely, the restoration of the broken unity of Christ's Body and the drawing together of the separated groups of His followers, we realise that one necessary element in that visible fellowship must be a ministry universally acknowledged. Thus considered, there is at present, no ministry which fully corresponds with the purpose of God. Yet we are persuaded that the historic continuity of the episcopal ministry provides evidence of the Divine intention in this respect such as to constitute a stewardship which we are bound to discharge.

We cannot regard the maintenance of separately organised churches as a matter indifferent or unimportant. The will and intention to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ must of necessity underlie all its organisation; and where that unity has been broken, the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministries which, in separation, must stand on a different footing. The will and intention of Christians to perpetuate separately organized Churches makes it inconsistent in principle for them to come before our Lord to be united as one body by the sacrament of His own Body and Blood. The general rule of our Church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate Inter-communion, or any such Inter-communion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organised Churches.

From what has been already said it will be evident why we hold as a general principle that Inter-communion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union, and also why the general rule of our Church has been, as set forth by the last Lambeth Conference, that members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church or of Churches in full communion with it.

But we recognise that the rule quoted above is a rule of discipline, and as such is subject to exception where the purpose of that discipline can thus be better served. We hold that the administration of such a rule of the Church falls under the discretion of the Bishop, who should exercise his dispensing power in accordance with any principles that may be set forth by the national, regional, or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned. Nor (we hope) will the Bishops of the Anglican Communion question the action of any Bishop who may in his discretion so exercised sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas where the ministrations of his own Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own, should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican Churches when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special and temporary circumstances. We would repeat the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 that "in cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop's judgment to be obtained beforehand, the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord's Table unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful."

Turning now to the response made by the representatives of non-episcopal communions to the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, we note that the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland could not take up the matter ten years ago, because they were in the midst of the process which happily culminated in one Church of Scotland. We are encouraged to hope that an invitation to enter into unrestricted conference on the basis of the Appeal would now be sympathetically received, and we hope that it may soon be found possible to issue such an invitation.

Following on the Appeal, conferences were held at Lambeth Palace between representatives of the Church of England and of the English Free Churches. We notice with great satisfaction how far they were able to advance towards agreement. We believe that on all hands a greater spirit of fellowship prevails. We desire to acknowledge with thankfulness the reality of brotherly love which unites us with members of these Communions and was richly experienced in the conferences to which allusion has been made. But we have to admit that the desire for re-union is, in most parts of the world, very far from strong among the general membership of the several communions. We cannot hope that definite steps towards re-union can be taken until that desire is widespread. But we wish to leave no method unexplored by which it might be facilitated.

The chief difficulty disclosed by the former conferences, to which allusion has been made, did not concern the basic principles of the united Church, for, in outline at least, agreement was reached that the principles of the Lambeth Appeal should be accepted. The chief difficulty concerned the interim period which would elapse before all ministers are episcopally ordained. It is our earnest hope that without undue delay joint conferences with representatives of the non-episcopal Communions may again be initiated to consider this difficulty and the means by which it might be overcome. The method for which a preference was expressed by the Lambeth Conference in 1920—the method of mutual commission by means of the form used in each Communion for commissioning its ministers—has been found inacceptable by the Free Church representatives. We would urge that other possible methods which have been suggested in various quarters may be considered, but especially we recommend that such Conferences should take note of the way of meeting the difficulty which is adopted in the Proposed Scheme for Union in South India, and which appears to offer hope of success. We do not suggest that that scheme as it stands could be adopted in any other circumstances than those which it was designed to meet; but we think the principles on which it rests may be found capable of application in other fields.

Among the events which have followed the issue of the Appeal and are worthy of record is the adoption of a Canon in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, providing for the episcopal ordination of a non-episcopal minister who would continue to fufil his ministry with his existing congregation under certain conditions.[1] The Committee consider that where an agreement could be reached on matters of faith and discipline and as to the essential elements for the administration of the sacraments this Canon forms a useful precedent. We have had indications that there might be some response to such a proposal as we have in mind; and we commend it to the authorities of any province which may have to deal with such a case.

---

[1] Bell. *Documents on Christian Unity*, First Series, p. 207.

We have felt bound to make this part of our Report consist mainly of an exposition of the principles set forth ten years ago in the Lambeth Appeal. Yet our Report is itself an indication of very real advance in ways that have been opened for us in two quarters. In the first place the Orthodox Church has been willing to proceed from a general exchange of views to definite negotiations; and it is because our conference with them had that character that we have set out the record of it so fully; and secondly, the South India Scheme is a definite and practical proposal to which we have given great attention, and which may be found, as has been already said, to suggest a method by which in other parts of the world it is possible to make an approach to re-union with non-episcopal communions.

We approach the problem of the restoration of union as those who believe that they have received from God a trust which they must bring unimpaired to the united Church. We believe that in those principles of the Church's life which we have inherited, with their historic continuity in the spheres alike of Faith and of Order, we have at once a treasure and a source of stability which are of special worth in an age when all traditions and conventions are called in question.

In the experience of many of us this heritage of Faith and Order seems to be one and indivisible, and to have its roots in the redemptive method of God in the Incarnation. To those who share that view the historic Order and the prominence of sacramental worship which commonly accompanies it stand for and bears constant witness to the God-given element in the Christian life, which is prior to and independent of all subjective feeling on our part. But whether or not we find Faith and Order thus welded together in our experience, we are all united in thankfulness for the heritage that is ours; and for it we are bound to stand.

But while we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as a necessary element in any union in which the Anglican Communion can take part, and have given our reasons for so doing, we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union. We recognise as fully the gifts of the one Spirit entrusted to those others, and their equal responsibility to maintain their several trusts; and we are content to believe that the acceptance of the Episcopate itself, in its continuity of succession and consecration, and in the discharge of its historic functions, will bring to the united Church those gifts of Grace which, as we believe, the Providence of God has associated with it.

With such general principles to guide us we turn to consider definite events or movements directly affecting our position as thus described. And first we must make reference to the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in 1927.

### THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE

We have already drawn attention to the Report of the Lausanne Conference on the Gospel Message. The great achievement of that Conference was the testimony it gave to the real unity of faith on the part of the different Churches which were there represented; but, beyond that, considerable progress was made towards a common understanding on the nature of the Church, the Creed, the Doctrine of the Sacrament and the Christian Ministry.

With regard to the Churches' common Confession of Faith, the following statement was agreed to :—

> " Notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Œcumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ."

With regard to Baptism, it was stated :—

> " We believe that in Baptism administered with water in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins, we are baptized by one Spirit into one body. By this statement it is not meant to ignore the difference in conception, interpretation and mode which exist among us."

On the Holy Communion :—

> " We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, that we have fellowship with God our Father in Jesus Christ His Son, our Living God, who is our one Bread, given for the life of the world, sustaining the life of all His people, and that we are in fellowship with all others who are united to Him. We agree that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the Church's most sacred act of worship in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed, and that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an act of solemn self-oblation."

With regard to the Ministry, it is stated that the Ministry "is perpetually authorised and made effective through Christ and His Spirit," and "that men gifted for the work of the Ministry, called by the Spirit and accepted by the Church, are commissioned through an act of ordination by prayer and the Laying-on of Hands to exercise the function of this Ministry." The need for a Ministry universally acknowledged is recognised; "consequently the provision of a Ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need." And it is further stated :—

> "In view of (1) the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the Congregation of the faithful, respectively, had in the constitution of the early Church, and (2) the fact that episcopal, presbyterial and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendon, and (3) the fact that episcopal, presbyterial and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church, we therefore recognise that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a re-united Church, and that each separate communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures."

It is quite true that these further Reports were not accepted with the wholeheartedness and unanimity which characterised the acceptance of the Report on the Gospel, but they implied a general recognition of the lines on which a common agreement might be attained, and we thankfully acknowledge the value of this great effort in the cause of Christian unity.

We welcome also in the Reports of the Lausanne Conference the clear statements of differences on which further light must be sought in future conferences between the Churches concerned.

## UNITY IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Having thus reviewed the movement towards union among separated Churches, and before we turn to consider specific proposals brought to us for our consideration, we pause to recall the fact that one great contribution which we have to make to the general cause is that of unity within our own body. Just because we unite together so many types of Christian experience, this unity is difficult to maintain and of special value when secured. We would call upon all members of the Anglican Communion, of whatever school of thought, to do their utmost, in co-operation with those of other schools, to promote mutual understanding and appreciation. This is an evident duty for the well-being of our Church, but it is all the more obligatory in view of the hindrance caused to the Church's missionary work by our divisions and by the spirit sometimes manifest in the controversies that arise from them.

## STEPS TOWARDS UNION IN PERSIA

We have received the Proposals for a United Church of Persia as approved by the Inter-Church Conference held at Isfahan, July 23rd–August 5th, 1927.

We rejoice to hear of the growth of this Young Church in a Moslem land, and its zeal in the evangelisation of Islam; and desire to express our sympathy with the fervent desire of the Persian Church to be organically united.

We note that the Church in Persia is, for different reasons set forth in the Proposals, not yet ready for formal Union. We encourage the Church in Persia, however, to go forward towards this goal, carefully studying present movements in other parts towards Church Unity, and, in particular, the Scheme for a united Church of South India.

We regard it as essential for the Unity of the Church, that the Historic Episcopate, in a constitutional form, should be definitely aimed at as the Order of the United Church of Persia. By this we do not mean that it should be an Anglican Church; indeed, we hope that the Church of Persia, developing along the lines of its own genius, will have some particular contribution of its own to bring into the Catholic Church. But we urge that, if the Church of Persia is to be a vital part of the great Re-united Church, it should go forward along the lines of the three-fold historic Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, on which lines the Church is so clearly moving to-day.

We sympathise with the Church of Persia in its natural desire to be independent of external jurisdiction, and we look forward to the time when it will be completely free to develop according to its own national genius as a Province of the Church Universal. In the meantime, while steps are being taken to reach this goal, we gladly place at the disposal of the Persian Church all the experience that the Anglican Communion has gathered during the course of its history.

We have given sympathetic regard to the proposal that, at future ordinations in the two divisions in the Church, prior to the Consummation of Union, two ordained ministers from the

Northern (Presbyterian) Churches join in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of an Episcopal minister; and, similarly, that the Bishop should take part in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of a minister in the Presbyterian Church. We recognise that there are inherent difficulties in this proposal, but recommend that in view of the situation existing in the Church in Persia, due enquiry be made with a view to discovering whether some Scheme of Joint Ordination be possible, always providing, on our part, that the essentially Episcopal nature of the ordination be properly safeguarded.

## THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME

It is with reference to the principle we have already set forth that we have considered the Proposed Scheme of Union affecting the southern dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church and the South India Province of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

First it is important to make clear the way in which this scheme came before the Lambeth Conference. It was not submitted for acceptance or rejection. The Lambeth Conference has no constitutional authority to accept or reject such proposals; the responsibility for action lies with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.[1] That Church has throughout fully recognised this fact. But before exercising its responsibility it has desired, in the spirit of fellowship, to ascertain the views of the Bishops belonging to other Provinces of the Anglican Communion, inasmuch as the whole of that Communion may be greatly concerned in and affected by what takes place. Accordingly, the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon submitted the Proposals to the Lambeth Conference, together with certain Resolutions of the General Council and certain expressions of its opinion on special points by which it desires that its own delegates may be guided at future meetings of the Joint Committee of the uniting Churches, in order that the assembled Bishops might offer their advice. The Episcopal Synod further asked for such advice with reference to four specific points and communicated one other on which the General Council desired to obtain the opinion of the Conference.

Secondly, it should be plainly understood that "the scheme is frankly an outline." In its present form it is the work of a joint committee on which representatives of the Churches concerned have been serving since 1920. It is an endeavour to state the central points on which agreement is necessary for union, for presentation to the Governing Bodies of the Churches concerned in India and elsewhere. No final conclusions have been reached on these central points by any of the Churches concerned. And, as the Joint Committee itself declares, even after agreement on the central points many details would still remain to be worked out.

---

[1] Cf. Resolution 11 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. "The Conference recognises that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions must be undertaken by the various national, regional or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion."

One very important fact, however, as to the general position of the united Church[1] is impressed upon our minds at the start. We find in the proposed scheme a conception which is alike bold and new. The Joint Committee definitely intend that the Church in which the uniting bodies are to converge shall be autonomous in the fullest sense. It is to be free from any control legal or otherwise of any Church or society external to itself. The Anglican dioceses concerned are to be no longer a part of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. The suggestion that the united Church should form a new province of that Church is rejected, on the ground that such an arrangement would have the appearance, and even something of the eality, of the absorption of the South India United Church and of the Wesleyan Church of South India in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. Those dioceses will therefore not be Anglican dioceses in which we are asked to recognize elements foreign to the Anglican system; they would go forth from the Anglican Communion in order to make their own distinctive contribution to the faith and order of the new united Church. Moreover, the Church in which those dioceses are to be embraced will be itself "a distinct province of the Universal Church," with a rule and character of its own. It is understood on all sides and is recognised in the scheme itself that no province of the Universal Church is free to act according to its own choice in contravention of the faith once for all delivered to the Saints or without regard to the preservation of the fellowship of the Church Universal.

From the position thus frankly stated follow certain results. The Anglican Communion consists of various Provinces and Dioceses in full communion with the Church of England. At the present time the Lambeth Conference is the visible bond which unites the different portions of the Anglican Communion to one another. It consists of Bishops in full communion with the Church of England and exercising oversight over Anglican dioceses. But the united Church in South India will not be a part of the Anglican Communion.

---

[1] The phrase "united Church" is used to denote the Church that will exist if the Proposed Scheme of Union becomes operative, but it must not be taken to be the name by which that Church will be called.

This does not, however, involve anything in the nature of schism, for even though the united Church will not be an integral part of the Anglican Communion, the fact of the formation of the united Church will not deprive any members of the united Church, whether Bishops, Clergy or Laity, of any privilege of communion which they have hitherto enjoyed with the Church of England and with the Churches in communion with it.

Though the representatives of the Anglican Communion assembled in this Conference are not ready to express approval of every detail of the scheme, they are (we believe) desirous that the venture should be made and the Union inaugurated, and they hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches which are His. In this hope they wish to stand by the Church of India while she makes this experiment with generous goodwill.

We should hope that when the inauguration of the Union takes effect, the united Church will at once enjoy communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion in the following ways :—

(1) No censure should attach to any member, ordained or unordained, of a Church of the Anglican Communion who may be in South India or go thither, if he communicates with the united Church or takes work of any kind in it.

(2) No Church of the Anglican Communion should establish churches or congregations in the area of the union apart from the united Church.

(3) If communicant members or ordained ministers of the united Church should go into any diocese of the Anglican Communion, the Church of that diocese should receive them to communion whenever this can be done consistently with the regulations of each Province or extra-Provincial diocese, and episcopally ordained ministers of the united Church should be qualified, at the discretion of the Bishop, to officiate, subject to the regulations of the diocese for its own ministers.

These provisions represent certain restrictions upon full communion, that is to say, upon complete interchangeability of ministers and complete mutual admissibility to communion. We hope that when the unification within the united Church, contemplated in the Proposed Scheme, is complete, full communion in that sense will be secured between the united Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

We proceed to offer the comments and advice for which we have been asked.

We rejoice that those who have combined to draw up the Proposed Scheme have endeavoured to follow the method of incorporating the distinctive elements of all the uniting bodies, for we are convinced that this method alone corresponds to the facts of the situation.

We associate ourselves with the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, when it declares that it "recognises with great thankfulness that the Joint Committee has been guided by Almighty God to base the Scheme of Union upon the acknowledgment of essential truths and principles of the Christian Religion which the Church has ever held; namely, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation of the Son of God, the authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding the Faith, the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, and Christ's gift of the Ministry of His Church"; and also when it declares that "it observes with equal thankfulness that the Committee has been guided to seek the achievement of union by unifying the Ministry through adoption of the rule of episcopal ordination; and it desires to express its grateful appreciation of the service which has been rendered to the common cause by those who have been willing to change their customs in order to make this possible."

We therefore thank the Episcopal Synod and General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon for the courage and wisdom which they have shown in sanctioning the negotiations at various times. We know how closely they have studied the needs of the Church, and the local circumstances in which the union is projected. We are impressed by the very careful consideration which they have given to the Proposed Scheme in its present form, and are in general accord with the opinions and instructions which they have furnished to their delegates. We are prepared to encourage the General Council and the Bishops to continue to seek union, on the lines which their own Resolutions suggest, without committing ourselves to particular propositions or provisions in the Proposed Scheme. And we trust that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit such a union may result as may fulfil the desire of those concerned in the negotiations "so to organise the Church in South India that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal."

In giving our general endorsement to the Resolutions passed by the General Council, and the Opinions expressed by it with reference to the Proposed Scheme, we desire to call special attention to the following points :—

(1) We assent to the provision that those who unite in acceptance of the Episcopate with the functions assigned to it in the Scheme should not be required to accept any one particular interpretation of it.

(2) We approve the method of proceeding towards union by means of a pledge given in mutual trust, to respect the long-established traditions and conscientious convictions of the uniting Churches. Among such long-established traditions of our own we number the Preface to the Ordinal, and therefore understand this pledge to secure that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited, that an episcopally ordained ministry is within our Church required for the due administration of Holy Communion, will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule.

(3) We welcome the principle of the Scheme, which is that of uniting the Churches through unification of ministries so that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister, and inasmuch as the actual words in the Scheme dealing with this point have been challenged as indecisive, we hope they may be so modified as to put an end to all doubt. Similarly we suggest that the words referring to possible exceptions after the period of thirty years, which are left to the judgment of the united Church at that time, should be so modified as to make it clear that the intention is to reach finality in the unification of the ministry of the united Church.

(4) We approve the method by which it is sought to commend the use of Confirmation ; we assent to the provision that the acceptance of Confirmation should not be insisted on as a pre-requisite term of union ; but we most earnestly commend the use of it, both because of its association from the time of the Apostles with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and also because of the benefit which it has bestowed on individual members of our Church and the enrichment which it brings to the pastoral ministry of the Bishop.

Certain matters were specifically referred to us by the General Council or by the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. With regard to these we offer the following advice :

(1) It is pointed out to us that if the united Church comes into being on the basis of the Proposed Scheme, which includes the provision "that none of the existing Churches should cease to enjoy such privileges of fellowship with other Churches as they enjoyed before the Union," an anomalous situation will arise; the Anglican Communion will, at least to the extent already described, be in communion with the united Church, which will itself be in communion with bodies not in communion with the Anglican Communion. There is no doubt that this is anomalous. But we hold that as part of a movement towards general and complete union, to which the Proposed Scheme looks forward, such a situation may be covered by the principle of "economy."[1] Accordingly we are agreed that the situation described by the General Council constitutes no bar to the Church of India taking such action as it may think right.

(2) On the question of Consecration *per saltum*,[2] our view is that while undesirable in the normal course of the Church's life, such Consecration is not invalid and in the special circumstances of the inauguration of the united Church is justifiable.

(3) With reference to the question whether Confirmation is a necessary pre-requisite of Ordination, we wish to say that the prevailing custom of the Anglican Communion is to require Confirmation before Ordination, and we desire to commend this custom. But, inasmuch as there has been great variety of practice in the Church with regard to Confirmation, and it has not always been regarded as an indispensable preliminary to Ordination as Priest or Consecration as Bishop,[3] we do not see sufficient ground for urging the Episcopal Synod to insist upon it as a necessary part of the initial agreement.

(4) With reference to the participation of Presbyters in the Laying-on of Hands at the Consecration of Bishops our advice is as follows:—

> (*a*) We regard as legitimate the proposal that, in the inaugural service of Consecration, Presbyters should take part in the Laying-on of Hands, as we

---

[1] "Economy" is a technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order.

[2] *i.e.*, Consecration to the Episcopate without previous ordination by a Bishop to the diaconate and priesthood.

[3] Cf. S. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. III, *Supp.* Q. XXXV. A. 4.

think that this would symbolise the full concurrence of the uniting Churches, the passing on to the Episcopate of the authority which Presbyters have hitherto exercised in their own communions to confer Ordination, and the coming together in the ministry of the united Church of the spiritual blessings previously enjoyed by the ministries of the several Churches in separation.

(*b*) With regard to subsequent Consecrations, we hold that the participation by Presbyters in the Laying-on of Hands could not, in any way, affect the validity of the Consecration, provided, of course, that three Bishops take part in the Laying-on of Hands; but we prefer that it be not adopted lest it should tend to confusion, and we would urge that, if it be adopted, care should be taken to make it plain that the Presbyters do not take part as Consecrators.[1]

(5) With regard to the question whether it is in order for Bishops to grant authorisations to non-episcopally ordained ministers, we suggest that the difficulty might be avoided if the existing ministers of the uniting Churches who will continue to minister in the united Church "provided that they assent to the Basis of Union and accept the Constitution of the united Church" are not required to receive any fresh authorisation or licence for that purpose, and if non-episcopally ordained ministers who are received during the period of thirty years are at the request of the Church or Society entitled to send them received without episcopal authorisation or licence, the ministers in both cases agreeing to work under the "pastoral oversight" of the Bishop; but the Committee is unwilling to condemn the action of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon if with its consent Bishops of South India give such authorisation or licence to non-episcopally ordained ministers after the inauguration of a union agreed to by the Church, and in consequence of the exceptional circumstances created by the Union.

Having thus offered the counsel asked of us, we thank God for the signs of the guidance of His Holy Spirit as manifested by the degree and nature of the agreement already reached with regard to the Proposed Scheme of Union; we pray that the Bishops and other members of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon may still receive that guidance in the decisions which they will be responsible for making in this regard, and that in the result the united Church of South India may by God's blessing be brought into existence to His glory and the extension of His Kingdom.

---

[1] This would, as we understand, conform to the practice and principle of the Church of Sweden, which has missions in the area of the proposed union in South India.

# PART II

## Report on Relation to and Reunion with Episcopal Churches

### I

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

A copy of the Appeal to all Christian People was sent to the Pope and a courteous reply was received. But the most important matter to be reported is the series of Conversations held at Malines from 1921 to 1925 under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier between Anglican and Roman Catholic scholars. There took part in these discussions Viscount Halifax, Dr. Armitage Robinson (Dean of Wells), the Rev. W. H. Frere (now Bishop of Truro), Mgr. Van Roey, who succeeded Cardinal Mercier as Archbishop of Malines, and M. F. Portal. After the first two meetings they were joined by Dr. Gore (formerly Bishop of Oxford), Dr. Kidd (Warden of Keble College, Oxford), Mgr. Batiffol and M. Hemmer. There were no "negotiations." "The Anglicans," wrote the Archbishop of Canterbury, "who have, with my full encouragement, taken part, are in no sense delegates or representatives of the Church as a whole." Cardinal Mercier made it equally plain that the Roman Catholics had no mandate such as negotiations would require. Conversations were held between certain Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians with the knowledge and blessing of the Pope[1] and with the friendly cognizance of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was stated that what was sought was a *rapprochement des cœurs*. Among the matters discussed were the position of St. Peter in the New Testament and in the history of the Church; the relation between the Pope and the Bishops; and the doctrine of the Sacraments. Archbishop Davidson described the Conversations in a letter in which he said, "I expressed my readiness to have official cognizance of the arrangements, provided that a corresponding cognizance was given by the Vatican. Satisfied, after correspondence, with regard to that point, I gave what was described as friendly cognizance to a second visit of the Anglican group to Malines." Cardinal Mercier also gave an account of the Conversations in a letter to his clergy.

---

[1] Il nous suffisait de savoir que nous marchions d'accord avec L'Autorité suprême, bénis et encouragés par Elle. (Letter from Cardinal Mercier to his Clergy, 18 January, 1924. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 353.)

Since the death of Cardinal Mercier, such Conversations have been forbidden, and Roman Catholics have in the Encyclical letter, *Mortalium animos* (1928), been prohibited from taking part in any Conference on unity. The Committee desires to express its conviction of the value of such Conversations and Conferences carried out in a spirit of loyalty, and it much regrets that by the action of the Pope all such meetings have been forbidden, and Roman Catholics have been prohibited from taking part in conferences on Reunion. This regret, they have reason to believe, is shared by many members of the Church of Rome. They regret also that in the Encyclical the method of "complete absorption" has been proposed to the exclusion of that suggested in the Conversations, as, for example, in the paper read at Malines, "L'église Anglicane unie, non absorbée." There are difficulties greater than perhaps were realised in the scheme proposed, but it has the great merit of attempting to recognise to some extent at any rate the autonomy which might be possible in a united Church.

The Committee also repeat and endorse the statement made in 1908 and again in 1920, "that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition." However little prospect there may be at present of the attainment of any such ideal, the Committee feel that in any attempt at Reunion the unity of the whole Church must be in their minds, and they are not without hope that the attitude of the Church of Rome may in some parts of the world at any rate change in the not very distant future.

## II

## THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH

The Appeal to All Christian People was communicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Delegation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which was sent to the Lambeth Conference in 1920, published a full report of its visit.

The most important of all communications between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion was the Declaration made in July, 1922, by the Patriarch and Holy Synod of Constantinople, accepting the validity of Anglican Ordination :—

> "Accordingly, the Holy Synod, on this opportunity taking under our presidency the matter under consideration and having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church the Ordination of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of Bishops, Priests and Deacons possesses the same validity as the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the 'Charisma' of the Priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession."[1]

Declarations to the same effect were, subsequently, made by the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus. They have not, so far, been made by the other Patriarchates and Autokephalous Churches. The Patriarch of Constantinople stated, in an Encyclical to the other Orthodox Churches, that that Church "which has manifested the most lively desire to remove the obstacles towards *rapprochement* and indeed to full union with the Orthodox Church is the Episcopal Anglican Church."[2]

The present Lambeth Conference has been memorable for the presence of a most important Delegation from the Orthodox Church. It was composed of delegates, officially chosen, of all the Patriarchs and Autokephalous Churches, and was the most weighty Delegation ever sent by the Orthodox Church to any Western Church. It consisted of the following :

*From the Church of Alexandria:* His All-Holiness and Beatitude and Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletios II. *From the Great Church of Constantinople:* The Most Reverend the Metropolitan of Thyateira, Exarch of the Œcumenical Patriarch in Western and Northern Europe, Apokrisarios of the Œcumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Germanos. *From the Patriarchate of Roumania:* The Most Reverend the Archbishop of the Bucovina and Metropolitan of Cernautz, Nektarie. *From the Patriarchate of Yugoslavia:* The Most Reverend the Metropolitan of Novi Sad, Irinäy. *From the Patriarchate of Antioch:* The Most Reverend the

---

[1] Bell. *Documents on Christian Unity.* First Series, p. 93.

[2] Bell. *ib*, p. 95.

Metropolitan of Epiphania, Ignatios. *From the Patriarchate of Jerusalem*: The Most Reverend the Archbishop of the Jordan, Timotheos. *From the Church of Greece*: The Most Reverend the Archbishop of Corcyra, Athenagoras and The Venerable the Archimandrite Michael Konstantinides, Superior of the Orthodox Greek Community in London. *From the Church of Cyprus:* The Very Reverend the Metropolitan-designate of Paphos, the Archimandrite Leontios. *From the Orthodox Church of Poland:* The Venerable the Archimandrite Sabbas Sovietoff. The Right Reverend Païssy, Bishop of Znepolsky, representing the Church of Bulgaria, was also present.

The Delegation was present at the Services at Canterbury and St. Paul's and was received at a full Session of the Conference. The Sub-Committee have had four full conferences with the Delegation and have arrived at agreements on many points which seem of considerable importance. A statement of these agreements is appended to this Report.

It must be clearly understood that the paragraphs which follow are to be taken as an account of the conferences which in fact took place.

The Committee proposed, in the first place, that, in order that the theological relations of the two Churches should be examined and stated with greater fullness and accuracy than was possible at the present Conference, a Joint Theological Commission should be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Œcumenical Patriarch, acting in conjunction with the other Patriarchs and Autocephalous Churches, which might report to the Pro-Synod of the Holy Orthodox Church, and to the Lambeth Conference, or to the Synods of the Churches in the Anglican Communion. It must be remembered that preparations are now far advanced for holding, within the next year or so, a Pro-Synod of the Orthodox Church, at which many of the difficult questions which lie before that Church may be discussed. The relations of the Anglican Communion to the Orthodox Church will be one of the questions which are to be discussed at that Synod, and it is most important that an accurate statement on the various points which have been under consideration between the two Churches should be laid before it. This proposal was accepted by the Orthodox Delegation.

It was then proposed that the Terms of Intercommunion, drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches' Committee and published in 1921, should be accepted as the basis of discussion between the two Churches. The Delegation stated that these Terms seemed to them satisfactory, as a basis of discussion, but they desired that some further information should be given on the subject of the Holy Eucharist and of Ordination; and, though expressing a general agreement with the Terms, as a basis, they had not the authority to accept them. It seems to the Committee most important that the general lines of opinion on this subject should be publicly stated.

The second subject discussed was the question: "What is the supreme constitutional body in the Anglican Church which decides authoritatively in the matter of differences of Faith?" The situation in the Church of England and in different provinces of the Anglican Communion was stated. It was made clear that, in certain provinces, at any rate, the General Convention, or General Synod, included the clergy and laity for co-operation, but in matters of doctrine the final and governing decision, as well as the final statement of the point at issue, lay with the House of Bishops. It was stated that the Anglican Church laid great stress on the co-operation of the laity. The authentic decision in matters of faith, it was stated, would be given by the whole body of Bishops—without, however, excluding the co-operation and consultation of clergy and laity during the discussions. The Patriarch and the Delegation expressed their satisfaction with this statement.

The third question discussed was that of Discipline. Various statements were made, and the Patriarch expressed his satisfaction, at the same time saying that the Anglican discipline in moral questions was excellent and more severe than the Orthodox. He pointed out the great difficulty of administering discipline in Mohammedan countries. A certain amount of moderation was necessary on the part of some Orthodox Churches in non-Christian countries, for fear lest too hard a punishment might drive the offenders to leave their religion. Sympathy was expressed with the many difficulties which the Orthodox Church suffered, owing to political disabilities.

The fourth question discussed was that of Holy Orders: "Does the Anglican Church agree that Holy Orders is a *mysterion*, and that, in its succession, it is a link with the Apostles?" It was stated that the word "sacrament" or "*mysterion*" was, in the Anglican Church, used in a special sense with regard to the great Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. If, however, the significance of a sacrament lies in its being the outward and visible sign of a spiritual gift, then Holy Orders would be considered a Sacrament in that sense. The intention and meaning of the Anglican Church was so shown by the language used in the Ordination of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops. The Patriarch stated that the prayers and form of Ordination in the Book of Common Prayer satisfied the Orthodox. In some of the Thirty-nine Articles, however, there seemed to be a certain want of clearness. It was stated that it may be accepted that, if there were any ambiguity in the Thirty-nine Articles, they should be interpreted by what the Prayer Book itself said. This, it was stated by the Patriarch, was satisfactory to the Orthodox, and the Delegation concurred.

As regards the question of Apostolic Succession, it was stated that the intention of the Church of England was expressed in the Preface to the Ordinal. It was explained that the Church of England had always followed the rule that every Bishop must be consecrated by three Bishops and every Priest ordained by the Imposition of Hands by a Bishop. The Church of England, therefore, had always carefully preserved the Apostolic Succession and considered that there was, undoubtedly, thus a link with the Apostles. The Patriarch said that they were not very far from the formula which would satisfy, not only the theologians, but also the whole body of the Orthodox Church. He said that the theologians were satisfied both by the Preface to the Ordinal and, also, by the fact that the theologians of the English Church always maintained the validity of Archbishop Parker's Consecration.

The question was then discussed of the relation to the non-Episcopal Ministry implied in the Lambeth Appeal. The policy, which was outlined in the Appeal to All Christian People and might be carried out in relation to Reunion with non-Episcopal Bodies, was fully explained, and the Patriarch said that in this kind of activity he saw the practice of the Orthodox, which was known as "Economy." Some considerable discussion then took place on the question of Economy, and it was finally stated that the Orthodox position was that the Church has full authority from its Divine Founder to use Economy upon matters which concern the advantage of the Church, upon condition that it does not clash in any way with the fundamental grounds of Faith.

The next question discussed was the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. As regards the Doctrine of the Presence, it was stated that, at the time of the Reformation, the Church of England found it necessary to guard itself against materialistic theories and against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as it had been taught in the Mediaeval Church. The language of the Catechism and of the Articles was quoted: "That the Body and Blood of Christ are, verily and indeed, taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper" and "That the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Lord's Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and it was stated that after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in that they have the same efficacy as before the administration. This was further illustrated by the language used in the Prayer of Consecration, the form used in the different Liturgies of the Anglican Communion being explained.

With regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it was explained that, in this case, it had been necessary for the Church of England to guard against the error that the one Sacrifice offered by Our Lord on the Cross could, in any way, be repeated, and the words of the Consecration Prayer were quoted. The Doctrine was then explained, as it was expounded in the Reply of the Archbishops to Leo XIII, the following quotation being read :—

> " Further we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a ' nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross,' an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council [Trent]. But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist,—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; then next we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church ; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice."

The Delegation agreed that the teaching thus explained was in accord with Orthodox doctrine.

There was then considerable discussion on the question of Sacramental Ministrations to the Orthodox by Anglican priests when there was need and when no Orthodox priest was available. Attention was drawn to the very large extent to which this was necessary, especially in America. The Patriarch said that union in the Holy Communion was looked upon by the Orthodox Church as the sign of full Communion, and that such ministrations were irregular. There was no difficulty in Anglican priests administering Baptism and Marriage to the Orthodox, if members of the Orthodox Church could not otherwise obtain these Sacraments, and, as no objections had been raised, the custom of their communicating in Anglican Churches might, in his opinion and that of the

Delegation, continue until these questions could be settled. In the same way, it was irregular for members of the Anglican Communion to communicate in the Orthodox Church, although many instances might be quoted. All these questions, however, were still under consideration and would certainly be brought before the Pro-Synod of the Orthodox Church for decision.

The final question discussed was the unification of Orthodox Church Government in North America. This had become difficult. There were Greek, Syrian, Russian and Rumanian Bishops at present in the United States and in Canada. The best solution for the present was that Orthodox Christians should regard themselves as being under the control of the Bishop of their own language and nationality until the Orthodox Church, as a whole, decided on the form of organisation to be followed in America.

The Patriarch, finally, expressed the hope that a resolution —or resolutions—of the Lambeth Conference would deal with the matters which had been under discussion between them, and stated that, in the East generally, an explanation with regard to the Anglican Church and its Ministry was eagerly awaited. He asked whether it would be possible, following the model of the answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII, for a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, or from the Metropolitans of the Anglican Church, to be sent to the Œcumenical Patriarch, dealing particularly with the question of Holy Orders as a *mysterion*. Failing this, he suggested that possibly the Archbishop of Canterbury might write a letter to the Patriarch upon this subject, to be circulated to the different Churches, of a character similar to that in which he invited the Œcumenical Patriarch to send a Delegation.

We append to this Report a *résumé* of the discussions between the Patriarch of Alexandria, with the other Greek representatives, and the Bishops of the Anglican Communion who formed the sub-committee. This *résumé* has been agreed upon by both sides.

We must express our great regret that no Delegation of the Russian Church was able to be present at our conferences, and we should have been glad to have had the assistance of Russian theologians. We can only join in prayers with Christians all over the world that the persecution and sufferings of the Church of Russia may be brought to an end and that it may once more take its place with greater freedom and power of self-expression with the other great Churches of Christendom.

## A RÉSUMÉ OF THE DISCUSSIONS

## JULY 15TH–18TH, 1930

## BETWEEN THE PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA WITH THE OTHER ORTHODOX REPRESENTATIVES AND BISHOPS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AT LAMBETH PALACE

1. It was agreed that a Joint Commission of Orthodox and Anglicans should be appointed for the consideration of questions of Doctrine.

2. It was agreed by the Anglican Bishops that the "Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church," published under the auspices of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Eastern Churches Committee in 1921, though not officially communicated to the different Provinces of the Anglican Communion, are not inconsistent with the mind and doctrine of the Anglican Church.

3. It was agreed by the Orthodox Delegation that the suggested "Terms of Intercommunion," though they had not yet been officially considered, would form a useful basis of discussion with certain modifications.

4. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in questions of faith the authentic decision would be given in the Anglican Communion by the whole body of Bishops without, however, excluding the co-operation of clergy and laity during the discussions.

5. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the final authority in matters of Doctrine in the Orthodox Church lies with the whole body of Bishops in Synod, without excluding the expression of opinion by clergymen and laymen.

6. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Anglican Communion the Bishop has jurisdiction in questions of discipline through his own court in the first instance, with due provision for appeal to the Provincial Court or a similar body.

7. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that in the Orthodox Church spiritual causes are tried in spiritual courts, sentence being given in the case of a Bishop by a court of Bishops, in the case of other clergymen by the Bishop through his own court.

8. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Anglican Communion Ordination is not merely the appointment of a man into a particular post, but that in Ordination a special *charisma* is given to the person Ordained, proper to the Order, and that the nature of the special gift is indicated in the words of Ordination, and that in this sense Ordination is a *mysterion.*

9. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that the Preface to the Ordinal declares "that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of ministers in Christ's Church ; Bishops, Priests and Deacons," and that to preserve unbroken succession the rules regarding Ordination have been framed " to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England."

10. The Orthodox Delegation stated that they were satisfied with regard to the maintenance of the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church in so far as the Anglican Bishops have already accepted Ordination as a *mysterion*, and have declared that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer.

11. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist " the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," and that " the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and that after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded sacramentally as the Body and Blood of Christ ; further, that the Anglican Church teaches the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice as explained in the Answer of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Pope Leo XIII on Anglican Ordinations ; and also that in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Anglican Church prays that " by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion," as including the whole company of faithful people, living and departed.

12. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the explanation of Anglican Doctrine thus made with regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice was agreeable to the Orthodox Doctrine, if an explanation were to be set out with all clearness.

13. It was stated by the Anglican Bishops that in different parts of the Anglican Communion, Anglican Clergy, at the request of Orthodox Clergy, provide sacramental ministrations to Orthodox laity, who are out of reach of their own Church's ministrations ; that such clergy always desire to keep the Orthodox to whom they minister faithful to the Orthodox Church and are ready to teach them the Orthodox faith and to notify Orthodox Bishops or priests of persons thus receiving their ministration or instruction.

14. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that the whole question of arrangements in such circumstances is to come up

for discussion at the forthcoming Synod of the whole Orthodox Church.

15. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that it is the practice of the whole Orthodox Church not to re-baptize after Anglican Baptism.

16. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation that in its forthcoming Pro-Synod the Orthodox Church would probably not object to recognising the Baptism of children and their instruction from Orthodox books by Anglican clergy, or to marriage, or any other rites being performed by Anglican clergy (in case of need and where no Orthodox priest is available), provided that all persons baptized or married are properly registered as Orthodox, and their names notified as soon as possible to the competent Orthodox authority.

17. It was stated by the Orthodox Delegation with regard to the Holy Eucharist that, pending a formal decision by the whole Orthodox Church and therefore without giving the practice official sanction, for which it has no authority, it is of opinion that the practice of the Orthodox receiving Holy Communion from Anglican priests in case of need and where no Orthodox priest was available, might continue, provided that an Orthodox authority did not prohibit such a practice.

✠ ARCHBISHOP OF THYATEIRA, G. A. C. GLOUCESTR:

## III

## THE OLD CATHOLICS

In June, 1925, the Old Catholic Church of Holland, which had hitherto been in doubt as to the validity of Anglican Orders, declared its acceptance of our Orders :—

> "We believe that the Church of England has wished always to maintain the episcopal rule of the Church of antiquity, and that the Edwardine formula of consecration must be accounted valid. We therefore declare, without reservation, that the Apostolic Succession has not been broken in the Church of England."[1]

In September, 1925, the Conference of all the Old Catholic Bishops endorsed that acceptance, and expressed the fervent hope "of a future more intimate and powerful contact with the Church of England and her daughter Churches on a truly Catholic basis."[2]

---

[1] **Bell.** *Documents on Christian Unity.* Second Series, p. 64.

[2] **Bell.** *ib*, p. 66.

In addition to the presence of an important Delegation from the Œcumenical Patriarch, the present Lambeth Conference has been memorable for the attendance of an important Delegation from the Old Catholic Churches, consisting of :—

The Archbishop of Utrecht (Dr. Kenninck) ;
The Bishop of Haarlem (Dr. Van Vlijmen) ;
The Bishop of Deventer (Dr. Berends).

We regret that Dr. Küry, Bishop at Berne, who was to have been present as Secretary, was not able to come owing to illness.

The Committee had a conference, which extended over two full sessions, with the Delegation, and great progress was made towards a more complete understanding between the two Churches. The Archbishop of Utrecht stated that the Old Catholics stood for Catholicism, which must not be confounded with Romanism, and they wished to defend this Catholicism with stress and energy.

The Declaration of Utrecht, a copy of which is attached, was then considered, and it was agreed that there was nothing in the terms of that Declaration which might be an impediment to union between the Church of England and the Old Catholic Church.

In reply to questions, the Archbishop of Utrecht stated that the Declaration of Utrecht was binding upon the Old Catholic Church. He further stated that it was officially declared, in 1925, at the International Congress at Berne, that Anglican Orders were valid, and, therefore, Baptism and Confirmation administered by those who had received those Orders were also accepted. The Old Catholic Church definitely regarded the Anglican Eucharist as valid. The Archbishop of Utrecht stated also that it was the custom of the Old Catholic Church to communicate in one kind only, but any communicant could request the Communion in both kinds. The Old Catholic Church is prepared to give Communion to Anglicans, provided that they give notice to the priest beforehand and satisfy him as to their orthodoxy as loyal members of the Anglican Church. No request would be made that they should come to private confession first. But, before a public statement could be made of this authorisation, they would have to consult their Synod, and they were prepared to do this. With regard to Old Catholics receiving Communion from Anglican priests, this was left to the discretion of the individual.

The Archbishop of Utrecht cordially welcomed the proposal that there should be a Joint Commission on Doctrine, and said that if closer intercommunion could be achieved, the natural corollary would be that Bishops of the Anglican Church might take part in their Consecrations, and Old Catholic Bishops might take part in Anglican Consecrations.

At the second conference some conversation took place on the Terms of Intercommunion with the Orthodox Churches, which had been studied by the Delegation in the meantime. Explanations were given of the teaching of the Church of England on Scripture Tradition and Ministry, and the proposed Scheme of Union in South India was explained. The relations also of the Old Catholic and the Orthodox were discussed. It was stated that there was to be a Synod of the Old Catholic Church held in Vienna in September, 1931, that the question of the relations with the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church would be discussed, and that it was hoped that a very close union between all three might be the result of that conference. The hope was expressed that Delegations from both the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church would attend.

## NOTE

## THE DECLARATION OF THE CHURCH OF UTRECHT

The following is a translation of the Profession of Faith, or Declaration, of the Church of Utrecht, formulated by the Old Catholic Bishops assembled at Utrecht, September 24th, 1889 :—

1. We adhere faithfully to the Rule of Faith laid down by St. Vincent of Lerins in these terms :—" Id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est ; hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum." For this reason we persevere in professing the faith of the primitive Church, as formulated in the œcumenice symbols and specified precisely by the unanimously accepted decisions of the Œcumenical Councils held in the undivided Church of the first thousand years.

2. We therefore reject the decrees of the so-called Council of the Vatican, which were promulgated July 18th, 1870, concerning the infallibility and the universal Episcopate of the Bishop of Rome—decrees which are in contradiction with the faith of the ancient Church, and which destroy its ancient canonical constitution by attributing to the Pope the plenitude of ecclesiastical powers over all Dioceses and over all the faithful. By denial of his primatial jurisdiction we do not wish to deny the historic primacy which several Œcumenical Councils and the Fathers of the ancient Church have attributed to the Bishop of Rome by recognising him as the *Primus inter pares.*

3. We also reject the dogma of the Immaculate Conception promulgated by Pius IX in 1854 in defiance of the Holy Scriptures and in contradiction to the tradition of the first centuries.

4. As for other Encyclicals published by the Bishops of Rome in recent times—for example, the Bulls *Unigenitus* and *Auctorem fidei*, and the Syllabus of 1864—we reject them on all such points as are in contradiction with the doctrine of the primitive Church, and we do not recognise them as binding on the consciences of the faithful. We also renew the ancient protests of the Catholic Church of Holland against the errors of the Roman Curia, and against its attacks upon the rights of national Churches.

5. We refuse to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent in matters of discipline, and as for the dogmatic decisions of that Council we accept them only so far as they are in harmony with the teaching of the primitive Church.

6. Considering that the Holy Eucharist has always been the true central point of Catholic worship, we consider it our duty to declare that we maintain with perfect fidelity the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, by believing that we receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of bread and wine. The Eucharistic celebration in the Church is neither a continual repetition nor a renewal of the expiatory sacrifice which Jesus offered once for all upon the Cross; but it is a sacrifice because it is the perpetual commemoration of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, and it is the act by which we represent upon earth and appropriate to ourselves the one offering which Jesus Christ makes in Heaven, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 11, 12, for the salvation of redeemed humanity, by appearing for us in the presence of God (Heb. ix. 24). The character of the Holy Eucharist being thus understood, it is, at the same time, a sacrificial feast, by means of which the faithful, in receiving the Body and Blood of our Saviour, enter into communion with one another (1 Cor. i. 17).

7. We hope that Catholic theologians, in maintaining the faith of the undivided Church, will succeed in establishing an agreement upon questions which have been controverted ever since the divisions which have arisen between the Churches. We exhort the priests under our jurisdiction to teach, both by preaching and by the instruction of the young, especially the essential Christian truths professed by all the Christian confessions, to avoid, in discussing controverted doctrines, any violation of truth or charity, and in word and deed to set an example to the members of our Churches in accordance with the spirit of Jesus Christ our Saviour.

8. By maintaining and professing faithfully the doctrine of Jesus Christ, by refusing to admit those errors which by the fault of men have crept into the Catholic Church, by laying aside the abuses in ecclesiastical matters, together with the worldly tendencies of the hierarchy, we believe that we shall be able to combat efficaciously the great evils of our day, which are unbelief and indifference in matters of religion.

## IV

## THE SEPARATED CHURCHES OF THE EAST

The past ten years have witnessed a closer association in different quarters of the world between the Anglican Communion and these Ancient Churches of the East. But the sad and outstanding fact which we have to chronicle is the suffering which most if not all of them have had to endure as an aftermath of the War. With hardly an exception the Churches and the nations which they represent are minorities in the territory in which they reside; in some cases they have been banished from their homes, in others the conditions under which they are forced to live are full of hardship. It is also the lamentable truth that sickness, poverty and insecurity have often worked such havoc amongst them that their whole future as a people has become uncertain. They are sufferers indeed, and among the saddest of all the victims of the troubles which began in Europe and spread to the East. With a full heart we grieve with them, would desire to help them, and assure them of our sympathy and respect.

All the Churches with which we are here concerned have differed from the Orthodox faith, particularly with regard to the doctrine of the Person of Our Lord. In many cases a closer understanding of the present teaching of a particular Church and a sympathetic study of its liturgies has revealed that the ancient heresy has long since in fact passed away, though perhaps no formal abjuration of the heresy has been or could well be made. In the Lambeth Conference of 1908 the following resolution was adopted :—

> "In the event of doctrinal agreement being reached with such separate Churches, the Conference is of opinion that it would be right (1) for any Church of the Anglican Communion to admit individual communicant members of those Churches to communicate with us when they are deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and, conversely, for our communicants to seek the same privileges

in similar circumstances; (2) for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to permit our communicants to communicate on special occasions with these Churches, even when not deprived of this means of grace through isolation, and, conversely, that their communicants should be allowed the same privileges in similar circumstances."

As will be seen, doctrinal agreement as to the Person of Christ is at least within reach between us and certain of the Separated Churches with which we are concerned, and in one case sufficiently secured to justify occasional intercommunion of the kind contemplated in the resolution quoted above. We hope greatly that, as conditions improve, this doctrinal agreement may cover a wider range of Churches.

Moreover, the Churches which have been charged with Monophysitism are Eastern Churches, and we should greatly wish that their bonds with the Orthodox Church should be drawn closer and that our friendship with them should conduce to their Reunion with the Orthodox Church.

We desire further to emphasise the general principle that, in view of the important meetings which have been held during the present Conference with the Orthodox Delegation, special care should be taken to keep the Orthodox Church informed and to consult it with regard to any action which may be in contemplation between the Anglican Church and any one of the Separated Churches.

## *The Armenian Church*

The Sub-Committee had the opportunity of a conference with Bishop Tourian of the Armenian Church, and also had before them answers which Bishop Tourian had given, of an unofficial and personal character, on various questions which were asked him on behalf of the Archbishop's Committee on the Lausanne Report. He stated that the Armenian Church, although it had never accepted the dogmatic conclusions of the Council of Chalcedon, was orthodox in its theology. He explained that the validity of Anglican Orders had never come up for discussion before the Armenian Church and had never been questioned, and that the sanctuaries of the Armenian Church were put at the disposal of Anglican ministers in Constantinople and other places. Officially, there was no recognised intercommunion, but, if need arises, they are prepared to admit members of both the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches to communion unofficially, and, similarly, members of the Armenian Church would be prepared to receive the Communion in the Anglican Church. There was great friendliness displayed towards the Anglican Church, but it does not appear to the Committee that it is possible, at the present time, for political reasons, to recommend any further advances in the relation between the two Churches. The chief authority of the Church is the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin. The Catholicos has recently died and no successor has yet been appointed, and his position under the Soviet Government makes any official recognition most difficult. The Committee feel that it is our duty, at the present time, to do everything in our power to help this ancient and often sorely-persecuted Church, and to promote friendliness on the basis of intercommunion already attained, and to pray that, in God's good time, it may be possible for a closer union to be brought about between the Orthodox Church, the Armenian Church and the Anglican Church.

### *The Assyrian or Nestorian Church*

The young Patriarch, Mar Shimun Ishai (Jesse), who succeeded as Catholicos of the East in 1919, spent a year or more in England, receiving a course of education at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and at Westcott House, Cambridge. He is now back with his people at Mosul, but the Church has suffered much by reason of persecution and dispersion. As was noted in the Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, the Statement of Faith which was submitted by the Patriarch and Bishops of the Assyrian Church in 1911 is sufficient for doctrinal agreement, and the Service books are also compatible with Orthodox belief. It has not been possible, owing to political and other conditions, to obtain the authoritative statement recommended in 1920 as to whether or not the present ecclesiastical authorities in the Assyrian Church adhere to the position of 1911. We hope that an opportunity for securing such a statement may appear, and we are of opinion that some measure of spiritual hospitality should be authorised forthwith. It is to be added that the American Episcopal Church has done most valuable work in Mosul by helping the Assyrian Church both in education and in more material ways, and the American clergy do what they can to minister to Assyrians scattered in the United States. At the present moment, however, the whole Assyrian nation in Iraq is in a very unhappy plight, and exposed to grave danger.

### *The West Syrian or Jacobite Church*

Several communications have taken place between Mar Ignatios Elias III, the Syrian Orthodox Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the Eastern

Churches Committee acting as intermediary. In 1921 the Patriarch of his own motion enquired on what conditions members of his Church resident in the West, and especially in America, when unable to obtain the ministrations of their own clergy, might resort to the ministrations of Anglican clergy. A questionnaire was drawn up, with the help of certain theologians, dealing with the question of the two Natures, and Mar Ignatios in May, 1922, transmitted replies which stated the Faith of the Church in such a way as to be entirely adequate and in accord with the Orthodox faith. The Archbishop of Canterbury accordingly wrote officially to Mar Ignatios, informing the Œcumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Meletios III, at the same time, and stated that in his judgment the moment had come at which the Anglican Churches might act upon the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1908 already quoted. The offer of the Archbishop of Canterbury was provisionally accepted by the Jacobite Patriarch in a letter from Jerusalem on September 27th, 1922, though he stated that, owing to the difficulty of securing a meeting of the Council of his Metropolitans and Bishops, it was not possible to proclaim the arrangement. Further communications passed, so far as the very difficult political and other conditions permitted, and the correspondence is not yet completed; but it has advanced sufficiently in our judgment to allow of such occasional intercommunion as was recommended by the Lambeth Conference of 1908.

### *The Coptic and Abyssinian Churches*

A new Patriarch was elected in 1928, the Patriarch Cyril having died at the great age of 106 in 1927. The Bishop in Egypt who is in touch with the Coptic Church reports to the Sub-committee that closer ecclesiastical relations do not seem to be possible as yet.

Since the war contacts have been established with the Abyssinian Church which though autonomous is a daughter Church of the Coptic Church.

### *The Syrian Christians in Malabar*

The Syrian Christians in South India are, unhappily, much divided among themselves. That union should be achieved in their different communities is the desire of all their friends in India, and the Anglican communion at large. We would wish also that they might themselves bring their own distinctive contribution into the united Church now the object of so many hopes and prayers in South India. We know how deeply the thought of union appeals to individual members of these Churches, who have been praying for years for the healing of the sad divisions which have rent asunder the Church of Christ.

## V

## The Church of Sweden

The Appeal was sent to the Archbishop of Upsala, Primate of the Swedish Church, and the Bishops of that Church sent a long and reasoned reply. Since 1920 Swedish ecclesiastics have preached in our Cathedrals and Churches ; and Anglican ecclesiastics in theirs. Advantage has also been taken of the recommendations with regard to admission to Holy Communion. Further, two Anglican Bishops took part in the consecration of two Swedish Bishops in Upsala Cathedral on September 19th, 1920 ; and a Swedish Bishop took part in the consecration of three Anglican Bishops in Canterbury Cathedral on November 1st, 1927.

The Bishop of Lund came to England as a delegation to the Lambeth Conference from the Church of Sweden, and the Sub-Committee had the opportunity of an interview with him. Great pleasure was expressed by him, on behalf of the Swedish Church, in their close relationship with the Church of England. He then proceeded to speak of the other branches of the Scandinavian and Allied Churches. He drew attention, not only to the Churches of Norway and Denmark, from which Iceland is now separated as a distinct national Church, but also to the Churches of Finland, Esthonia and Lithuania. He expressed the great desire that they had in Sweden that all these Churches alike should enjoy the same relationship to the Church of England as the Swedish Church enjoyed. The difficulties which that raised were put forward and discussed at some length, and it was represented that there were reasons which made it desirable that investigation of the possibility of closer union and the terms on which it could be granted should be considered, first in relation to the Church of Finland.

The Church of Finland had had, until quite recent times, the historic Episcopate, and had only lost it through a combination of accidents. It would not, at present, however, be of any use to approach the Church of Finland, but it was thought that it might be desirable that, at some time when the present circumstances had changed, a letter should be addressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Church of Finland, proposing the appointment of a Joint Commission, which might investigate the whole question of the relation of the Church of Finland to the Church of England. It was possible that such a Commission might then consider further the other Scandinavian and Allied Churches. It was pointed out that Bishops had recently been consecrated for the Churches of Latvia and Esthonia by the Archbishop of Upsala; and that their position as outposts of the West demanded our sympathy and support.

There was considerable discussion about the position of members of the Swedish Church in America. The relationship of the Church of Sweden to the Augustana Synod was explained. It was stated that it was a great pleasure to the Church of Sweden that the members of their Church should receive the Sacraments and join in the worship of the Episcopal Church.

## VI

## THE MORAVIANS (UNITAS FRATRUM)

After the Lambeth Conference of 1920, the Archbishop of Canterbury reappointed the Committee to confer with the Moravian Church, and communications between the Archbishop's Committee and the Moravian Committee continued until 1924, when it was agreed that there should be a pause. It may, however, be noted that, with regard to the objection in Resolution 29 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, " so long as the *Unitas* retains its practice of the administration of Confirmation and the celebration of the Holy Communion by deacons," the Moravian Committee stated :—

(1) That, in certain circumstances, they would be " prepared to recommend to our Provincial Synod that authority to confirm be given to Presbyters at their ordination " ;

(2) That, without denying the principle on which they had hitherto acted, " for the sake of unity we are prepared to recommend to Synod that the celebration of the Holy Communion in the congregations be restricted to Bishops and Presbyters."

The suspension of negotiations was, in part, the result of difficulties as to communion between the Moravian Church and other (non-episcopal) Churches, and the permission apparently given in the Moravian Church to ministers of other denominations to celebrate the Eucharist in its churches.

A deputation of representatives of the Moravian Church in Great Britain and Ireland, consisting of the following :—

Bishop Arthur Ward (President of the Provincial Board),
Bishop P. A. Asmussen,
Bishop S. L. Connor,
J. N. Libbey, Esq. }
H. J. Arhm, Esq. } (Members of the Provincial Board),

had been appointed to meet the Conference, and the Sub-committee had the opportunity of discussing with them the question of the reappointment of the Committee to carry on negotiations. The practice and custom of the Moravian Church on many points was fully and carefully described. There was no doubt at all that the representatives of the Moravian Church had an earnest desire for the closest spiritual union with the Church of England, as with other Churches. Although they are a very small body, yet their enthusiasm for missionary work makes our relations with them most important in the mission field, and the Committee decided to recommend that the Archbishop of Canterbury should reappoint the Committee to carry on negotiations. It must be pointed out, however, that these conferences with the Moravian Church go back to the year 1868, and it seems to the Committee important that an effort should be made to arrive at a clear and practical statement on the points at issue, so that, at the next Lambeth Conference, a final decision may be made.

## SUMMARY

It will be seen that the ten years up to the time of the Conference (1920–1930) have witnessed :—

(1) An attempt at a *rapprochement des cœurs* as between the Roman Catholic Church and ourselves ;
(2) The official acceptance of Anglican Ordinations by two Patriarchates and one autonomous Church of the Eastern Orthodox Communion, constituting a very definite advance in ecclesiastical relations ;
(3) The official acceptance of Anglican Ordinations by all the Old Catholic Churches, thus preparing the way for full intercommunion ;
(4) A new and closer relationship between the Church of England and the Church of Sweden, as shown by official participation in one another's Episcopal Consecrations.

As is apparent from this Report, it has seemed to the Committee that the time has come when, in our relations to all the different Churches with which we are in contact, more definite negotiations should be carried on than has been possible so far, and that Joint Commissions should, mutually, investigate the points of difference and agreement in doctrinal statement between different Churches and should prepare statements which might be accepted by both sides. It must be remembered that no delegation has the power of arriving at any decision itself. If there is a meeting of the Pro-Synod of the Orthodox Church some time next year, the case for intercommunion between the Churches should be put before that Pro-Synod with fullness and with definite authority. If the Lambeth Conference is prepared to accept as a true statement of the teaching of the Church of England the points defined in the present discussions, it will make a great difference to the impression which the Church of England creates on the Eastern Church, and, both with regard to that Church and the Old Catholics, very much closer relations may result from future negotiations.

(Signed) WILLIAM EBOR:
*Chairman.*

## No. IV

# THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

## I

### Its Ideal and Future

1. The Anglican Communion has frequently been discussed at meetings of the Lambeth Conference, but we † believe that to-day it has become a subject of quite paramount importance, and raises far-reaching questions of principle which demand

---

† Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Accra.
Bishop of Alaska.
Bishop of Calcutta.*
Archbishop of Capetown.
Bishop of Cariboo.
Bishop of Colorado.
Bishop in Corea.
Bishop of Cuba.
Bishop of Damaraland.
Bishop of Edinburgh.
Bishop in Egypt and Sudan.
Bishop of Exeter.
Bishop of Falkland Islands.
Bishop of Grahamstown.*
Bishop of Hankow.*
Bishop Haynes.
Bishop of Indianapolis.
Bishop in Jerusalem.*
Bishop of Jamaica.
Bishop of Killaloe.
Bishop of Kimberley and Kuruman (*Secretary*).
Bishop King.
Bishop in Kwangsi-Hunan.*
Bishop of Labuan and Sarawak.
Bishop of Lagos.
Bishop Lander.
Bishop of Liberia.
Bishop of Mackenzie River.
Bishop of Maine.
Bishop in Madagascar.
Bishop of Masasi.
Bishop of Meath.
Bishop of Melanesia.
Bishop in Mid Japan.
Bishop of Nelson.
Bishop of New Mexico.
Bishop of Newcastle (N.S.W.).‡
Bishop of Newfoundland.
Bishop of Niagara.
Bishop on the Niger.*
Bishop in North China.
Bishop of North Tokyo.
Bishop of Norwich.
Bishop of Oxford.*
Bishop Palmer.*
Bishop of Panama Canal Zone.
Bishop Price.
Bishop of Rhode Island.*
Bishop of Salisbury (*Chairman*).
Bishop Shaw.
Bishop Smith.
Bishop in South Tokyo.
Bishop of Southampton.
Bishop of Southern Brazil.
Archbishop of Sydney.
Bishop of Tasmania.
Bishop of Tennessee.*
Bishop Thomas.
Bishop of Tinnevelly.
Bishop of Tokyo.
Bishop of Uganda.
Archbishop of Wales.
Bishop of Western Massachusetts.*
Bishop of Western Michigan.
Bishop of Worcester.
Bishop of Yukon.
Bishop of Zanzibar.

‡ *Died during the Conference.*

consideration. This is partly due to its expansion. Our Communion has come to occupy a large place in the thought of the Christian world, and provokes questionings as a world-wide institution. But the development has not only been in numbers. Flourishing young Churches are now in existence, conscious of themselves, and conscious of the world outside them, where half a century ago there were but struggling Missions or possibly no Christian work at all.

2. For their sake, then, as for our own, the time has come for us to make some explicit statement of the ideal before us and of the future to which we look forward.

Our ideal is nothing less than the Catholic Church in its entirety. Viewed in its widest relations, the Anglican Communion is seen as in some sense an incident in the history of the Church Universal. It has arisen out of the situation caused by the divisions of Christendom. It has indeed been clearly blessed of God, as we thankfully acknowledge ; but in its present character we believe that it is transitional, and we forecast the day when the racial and historical connections which at present characterise it will be transcended, and the life of our Communion will be merged in a larger fellowship in the Catholic Church. But in order to expound this ideal it is necessary to glance at the principle which, as we believe, underlies the constitution of the Church.

3. That principle is clear to us. There are two prevailing types of ecclesiastical organisation : that of centralised government, and that of regional autonomy within one fellowship. Of the former, the Church of Rome is the great historical example. The latter type, which we share with the Orthodox Churches of the East and others, was that upon which the Church of the first centuries was developing until the claims of the Roman Church and other tendencies confused the issue. The Provinces and Patriarchates of the first four centuries were bound together by no administrative bond : the real nexus was a common life resting upon a common faith, common Sacraments, and a common allegiance to an Unseen Head. This common life found from time to time an organ of expression in the General Councils.

4. The Anglican Communion is constituted upon this principle. It is a fellowship of Churches historically associated with the British Isles. While these Churches preserve apostolic doctrine and order they are independent in their self-government, and are growing up freely on their own soil and in their own environment as integral parts of the Church Universal. It is after this fashion that the characteristic endowment of each family of the human race may be consecrated, and so make its special contribution to the Kingdom of God.

5. The bond which holds us together is spiritual. We desire emphatically to point out that the term " Anglican " is no longer used in the sense it originally bore. The phrase " Ecclesia Anglicana " in Magna Carta had a purely local connotation. Now its sense is ecclesiastical and doctrinal, and the Anglican Communion includes not merely those who are racially connected with England, but many others whose faith has been grounded in the doctrines and ideals for which the Church of England has always stood.

6. What are these doctrines? We hold the Catholic faith in its entirety: that is to say, the truth of Christ, contained in Holy Scripture; stated in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; expressed in the Sacraments of the Gospel and the rites of the Primitive Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer with its various local adaptations; and safeguarded by the historic threefold Order of the Ministry.

And what are these ideals? They are the ideals of the Church of Christ. Prominent among them are an open Bible, a pastoral Priesthood, a common worship, a standard of conduct consistent with that worship, and a fearless love of truth. Without comparing ourselves with others, we acknowledge thankfully as the fruits of these ideals within our Communion, the sanctity of mystics, the learning of scholars, the courage of missionaries, the uprightness of civil administrators, and the devotion of many servants of God in Church and State.

7. While, however, we hold the Catholic Faith, we hold it in freedom. Every Church in our Communion is free to build up its life and development upon the provisions of its own constitution. Local Churches (to quote the words of Bishop Creighton) " have no power to change the Creeds of the Universal Church or its early organisation. But they have the right to determine the best methods of setting forth to their people the contents of the Christian faith. They may regulate rites, ceremonies, usages, observances and discipline for that purpose, according to their own wisdom and experience and the needs of the people." (Creighton, *Church and Nation*, p. 212. See also Article XXXIV.)

8. This freedom naturally and necessarily carries with it the risk of divergence to the point even of disruption. In case any such risk should actually arise, it is clear that the Lambeth Conference as such could not take any disciplinary action. Formal action would belong to the several Churches of the Anglican Communion individually; but the advice of the Lambeth Conference, sought before executive action is taken by the constituent Churches, would carry very great moral weight. And we believe in the Holy Spirit. We trust in His power

working in every part of His Church as the effective bond to hold us together.

9. The freedom of each separate Church thus resembles, both in its scope and in its limitations, the freedom of a member in a living organism. It performs its distinctive functions under the direction of the Head, and for the benefit of the whole body. If it functions in separation from the other members, or in imperfect correspondence with the will of Christ, it is not necessarily separated from the body, but its own life is impoverished, and the whole body is weakened and distracted.

10. From this survey of the character and mutual relations of the Churches comprised in the Anglican Communion we turn to the future. We have already referred to the racial and historical associations which at present characterise us; but already the racial bond has begun to disappear. The Churches growing up in China, Japan, India and other parts of the world, are joined to us solely by the tie of common beliefs and common life; and the historical connection whereby they owe their existence in the first instance to Anglican missionaries is receding into the past. The future is big with further possibilities. We are to-day in friendly relations with Churches altogether foreign to us in race and different in traditions. Those relations may ripen; and we know not what the future has in store. It is clear to us, however, that the development of unity with them will be something other than the expansion of the Anglican Communion as we have known it. But we hope that, even though in some instances, and for the time, the bond may be loose, there will nevertheless emerge in principle an instalment of the final unity of the Catholic Church.

11. And we dare to look further still. We humbly believe that when in God's good providence the Church Universal now divided is finally brought together in the unity which is His will, the foundation of this unity will be the freedom based upon common fundamental beliefs which has ever been our heritage: and that if ever in the days to come a council of the whole Church were to be called together, it would be assembled on a plan of autonomy and fellowship similar to that which is the basis of our Conference to-day.

## II

### ORGANISATION: CENTRAL

1. We are of opinion that the Consultative Body should function as a continuation committee of the Lambeth Conference.

2. It is important that the Consultative Body should be recognised as possessing no authority beyond that possessed by

the Conference itself. We call attention to the statement of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, reaffirmed in 1920, that the Consultative Body is purely advisory. It has no legal functions as an Appellate Tribunal, and we do not recommend that any central Appellate Tribunal should be appointed. Such centralised authority would, we believe, be contrary to the spirit of the Anglican Communion. We contemplate that Appellate Tribunals will be constituted locally. The authority of the Consultative Body is moral.

3. The Consultative Body can be referred to by any Bishop or group of Bishops on questions of faith, order, policy or administration. But in view of the many questions deliberately left open in the Anglican tradition, the Consultative Body should be free to refuse to entertain any particular question. Moreover, Resolution No. 44 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 has already indicated that some limitation may be imposed by the regulations of Provinces or of national or regional Churches.

4. In considering any question the Consultative Body should have the power to call in any expert advisers—theological, liturgical, legal or administrative—at its discretion, before giving its advice. This power would, in our opinion, make the continuance of the Committee for Liturgical Questions, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the request of the Conference of 1920, no longer necessary.

5. We recommend that hereafter the members of the Consultative Body should be appointed to represent the Lambeth Conference by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with due regard to regional requirements, after consultation with the Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops. Vacancies should be filled in the same way. The first appointment should be made within 18 months of this meeting of the Lambeth Conference, and should hold good until the next meeting of the Conference. Meanwhile, the present Consultative Body should continue to function. We recommend that the number of members be not less than 18.

We deprecate the appointment of any formal or official Secretariat, which we believe would tend to the development of centralised authority.

6. The usual duties of the Consultative Body would be :—

(1) To carry on the work left to it by the preceding Lambeth Conference.

(2) To assist the Archbishop of Canterbury in the preparation of the business of the ensuing Conference.

(3) To deal with matters referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury on which he requests its aid.

(4) To deal with matters referred to it by any Bishop or group of Bishops as indicated earlier in our report.

## III

## ORGANISATION: NATIONAL, PROVINCIAL AND DIOCESAN

### 1. *The Diocese the Unit*

Your Committee would base their considerations on acceptance of the ancient Catholic principle that the fundamental unit of Church organisation is the territorial Diocese under the jurisdiction of one Bishop.[1] A duly organised Diocese under its Bishop has the right, subject always to its duty to the whole fellowship of the Church, to decide and act for itself in its own affairs. The experience of the Church, however, has shown (in the words of Resolution 43 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920) that "it is undesirable that Dioceses should remain indefinitely in isolation, or attached only to a distant Province."[2]

### 2. *Importance of Provincial Organisation*

Your Committee therefore recommends in accordance with that Resolution that the formation of Provinces should everywhere be encouraged, and each newly-founded Diocese should as soon as possible become a member of a Province.

Six main reasons may be given for this.

Provincial organisation

(*a*) gives practical expression to the Church's fundamental principle of fellowship, which is further fostered by common action in Provincial Synods.

(*b*) offers opportunities for mutual consultation between Bishops and Dioceses on any questions of faith, order and discipline which cannot satisfactorily be dealt with by a single Bishop or Diocese.

(*c*) facilitates common action in regard to other Provinces, to Governments, or to the general public: also in the formation of new Dioceses, in fixing the standards of worship, and in securing common rules of discipline for the Province, and in the promotion of union with other Christian communions.

---

[1] In special cases there may be a Co-adjutor Bishop, or one or more Assistant Bishops, or Bishops holding a special commission from the Diocesan Bishop. But the authority of such other Bishops is always derived from the Diocesan Bishop, in whom jurisdiction within the Diocese originally inheres.

[2] The term "Province" has various uses in the Anglican Communion, but throughout this Report will denote any group of Dioceses which has some central authority or authorities for the direction and government of the Church in the Province, whether such group calls itself a Province or a Church (*e.g.*, the Church in the U.S.A.).

(*d*) makes economies of man-power and money possible; *e.g.*, in the provision of central theological colleges and of schools or hostels, and in a provincial scheme of pensions for the clergy.

(*e*) promises relief to the Archbishop of Canterbury, where extra-provincial Dioceses now attached to the See of Canterbury can be organised in a Province.

(*f*) tends to obviate the dangers which are the counterpart of the advantages just described. An isolated Diocese may fail to realise its proper relationship to the whole Church. An isolated policy may be unwise. Isolated action may be weak and ineffective; and an isolated Diocese may so emphasise certain elements of the faith, the order or the worship of the Catholic Church as practically to exclude others equally valuable and necessary.

There are cases, however, where geographical situation, language or nationality, or other special reasons make it impossible for a Diocese to join in an existing Province or to form a new Province together with other Dioceses. In some of these cases what is now a single Diocese may be expected, as it grows and develops, itself to become a Province; in other cases it may be hoped that in course of time the existing difficulties in the way of provincial organisation will pass away or be overcome.

### 3. *The Degree and Nature of Organisation essential in a Province*

The final responsibility and authority for guarding the faith, order and discipline of the Church belongs to the Episcopate. Accordingly, the minimum organisation essential to provincial life is a House or College of Bishops which can act corporately in discharge of these duties. In a fully developed Province the functions of direction and government are of various kinds, legislative, judicial and executive; and in most Provinces are exercised (with certain exceptions) not by the Bishops alone but by the Bishops together with representatives of the clergy, or of the clergy and the laity. But the only thing essential to provincial life in its initial stages is that the Bishops should act corporately in dealing with questions concerning the faith, order and discipline of the Church. The right to consecrate Bishops without reference to authorities exterior to the Province has often been regarded as equally essential, but your Committee does not think that this can in all cases be considered as essential to the forming of a Province. At the same time your Committee feels strongly that the right to appoint and consecrate its own Bishops should be surrendered to a new Province as soon as possible after it has been constituted.

Your Committee therefore recommends that as soon as a group of Dioceses can make arrangements for a House or College of Bishops which will as a corporate body deal with questions concerning the faith, order and discipline of the Church, and will also fulfil any such other usual functions of a House of Bishops as local circumstances permit, they should be recognised as forming an organised Province of the Anglican Communion, and the chairman of the House of Bishops (by whatever title he may be designated) should be recognised as having the status of a Metropolitan.

The minimum number of Dioceses suitable to form a Province is four, this number giving reasonable opportunity of corporate action by the Bishops, and also providing that on the vacancy of a See there will be in the Province the number of Bishops necessary for the consecration of a new Bishop.

### 4. *Procedure in the Formation of a Province*

In conformity with what has been said above, the first step in the formation of a Province by a group of Dioceses which are under the oversight of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or whose Bishops are Bishops of some other Province, should be the preparation and acceptance by the Bishops of those Dioceses of a tentative constitution for the proposed Province. It is most desirable that in this action they should as fully as possible consult with the whole body of the Church in each Diocese and gain its consent to the union of the Dioceses under the proposed constitution. They should further seek to gain the approval of neighbouring Provinces which may in any way be affected by the formation of the new Province, as well as that of the authorities under which they have hitherto worked. The acceptance of the constitution should then be notified by the Bishops to those authorities, and request be made that the new Province be recognised as such and that its Bishops be released from obedience to other authority, as far as is necessary to enable them to subscribe to the constitution of the new Province and (if so required) take the oath of canonical obedience to its Metropolitan. If this request be granted, the new Province may then be formally constituted by the procedure of the Bishops and their Clergy subscribing to its constitution, and of the Bishops (if so required) taking the oath of canonical obedience to its Metropolitan ; and the Metropolitan should thereupon notify all Metropolitans in the Anglican Communion of the formation of the Province.

### 5. *Certain specific points*

#### (*a*) *Metropolitans*

The duties and powers of the Metropolitan or other chief officer of the Church in a Province vary greatly in different parts of the Anglican Communion. Your Committee thinks that it is sufficient to repeat the recommendation made by the Conference in 1920 that where the office is attached to a particular See, special arrangements should be made for the election of a Bishop for that See, so that the other Dioceses of the Province may have their due share in his election.

#### (*b*) " *Missionary Dioceses* "

The rights of a fully developed Diocese to decide and act for itself in its own affairs are not necessarily all to be exercised in the early stages of Diocesan life. The term " Missionary Diocese " is often used in this connection, but this term is ambiguous, and when it is used in the Canons of certain Provinces as a technical term its meaning varies. Until a Diocesan Synod or Council is formed, capable of co-operating with the Bishop in the management and good government of the Diocese, the Bishop, with the help of whatever consultative body he may be able to set up, must himself fulfil the functions which at a later stage will be fulfilled by the Bishop in Synod.

Similarly, even when a Diocesan Synod or Council has been formed, it will not necessarily be at once capable of fulfilling the important duty of electing a Bishop for the Diocese; and if this is the case, the appointment of a Bishop must still rest with the authorities of the Province of which the Diocese forms a part or to which it is attached, or, in the case of many Dioceses, with the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is, however, generally desirable that there should in some way be consultation with the Diocese before an appointment is thus made. It must rest with the provincial authorities or the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the case may be, in consultation with the Bishop, to determine the successive stages at which a Diocese can be entrusted with greater responsibility whether for legislation and general government or for the election of its Bishop.

#### (*c*) *Relations between Dioceses and Provinces*

Each Diocese as the unit of ecclesiastical organisation is rightly autonomous within its own area. Except, therefore, in cases where power has been given by Dioceses to a provincial Synod, no act of a provincial Synod is operative in a Diocese until it has been accepted by the proper authority in that Diocese.

But inasmuch as the Diocese is itself a part of the larger whole, any enactment of the Diocesan Synod which affects other Dioceses in the Province is properly subject to revision or rejection by the provincial Synod.

### 6. *New Provinces established or proposed*

(*a*) Your Committee notes with thankfulness the development of the Churches in Japan and China which, under the blessing of Almighty God, have now become organised Provinces, each with its own College of Bishops, and with its General Synod of Bishops, Clergy and Laity ; and your Committee recommends that the Lambeth Conference should formally welcome the Nippon Sei Kokwai and the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui as constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion.

(*b*) Your Committee welcomes the measure of progress already made towards the formation of a single Province in East Africa ; it regrets that this is not immediately possible, but trusts that it will in due course become an accomplished fact. Meanwhile it rejoices to know that the Bishops of the eight Dioceses concerned will be meeting together at regular intervals for mutual fellowship and the discussion of common problems.

(*c*) Your Committee is glad to note that although the time is not yet ripe for the definite preparation of plans for a Province in West Africa, the Bishops of that region are making arrangements to meet together for mutual counsel.

(*d*) Your Committee is glad to learn that there seems to be a prospect that the Anglican Dioceses and episcopal jurisdictions bordering on the Mediterranean and in Europe may before long acquire some form of provincial organisation.

### 7. *National Churches*

Your Committee is of opinion that it is consistent with the past history of the Church, and may be of real advantage, that Provinces or Dioceses within the borders of one national territory should be associated in one organisation sometimes spoken of as a “ National Church.” The authority of such a “ National Church ” is in theory derived from that of the Provinces or Dioceses which constitute it, and on whose behalf it acts.

The peculiar function of a “ National Church ” is two-fold. On the one hand (to quote from the Constitution of the Church of India), "the liberty of a regional Church has enabled and may in any place enable the God-given genius of great nations to find its appropriate expression in the worship and work of the Church." On the other hand, a "National Church" by its intimate connection with the nation as a whole can effectively influence the national life. A "National Church," however, must be on its guard lest the spirit of nationalism weaken its loyalty to the whole Catholic Church, lest it lend itself to unworthy political ends, and lest it expose itself to undue interference by the secular state.

### 8. *Questions of Church Order and Worship*

Your Committee wishes to re-affirm Resolutions 36 and 37 of the Conference of 1920 :—

*Resolution* 36.—While maintaining the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, we consider that liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion. The conditions of the Church in many parts of the mission field render inapplicable the retention of that Book as the one fixed liturgical model.

*Resolution* 37.—Although the inherent right of a Diocesan Bishop to put forth or sanction liturgical forms is subject to such limitations as may be imposed by higher synodical authority, it is desirable that such authority should not be too rigidly exercised so long as those features are retained which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion.

### INTERCHANGE OF CLERGY

In view of differences of standard and qualification for Holy Orders demanded in the various provinces, we consider the principle of discrimination involved in such regulations as the Colonial Clergy Act to be legitimate, and that it is further desirable that steps should be taken to apply that principle in other parts of the world.

The Colonial Clergy Act defines the procedure of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in dealing with this question. We consider that in spite of what has been urged to the contrary, experience detailed to our Sub-committee continues to show that it is undesirable to modify its provisions. We do not, however, invite the Lambeth Conference to pass a resolution on this particular Act.

## CLERGY PENSION FUND

We generally approve the principles of the Comprehensive Scheme of reciprocal arrangements for pensions submitted by the Church of England Pensions Board, and we recommend that a Committee be appointed consisting of a representative from each Church concerned to confer with the Pensions Board on the scheme, so that such representatives may report thereon to their respective Churches.

(Signed) ST. CLAIR SARUM:
*Chairman*

## No. V

# THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

*The Committee*[†] *appointed to consider and report upon the Ministry divided itself into two sub-committees dealing with*

I. The Supply and Training of Candidates and Voluntary Clergy,

II. Deaconesses, the Ministry of Healing, and Communities.

*Of these two sub-committees the former was presided over by the* Bishop of Manchester, *and the latter by the* Bishop of Blackburn. *Each sub-committee is responsible for its own Report, but the whole Committee accepts responsibility for the Resolutions founded upon each section of the Report.*

## I

### (*a*) Supply of Men for Holy Orders, and the Church's Duty to Provide for Them

I.—We, appointed as your Committee, are convinced that we should emphasise before all else the fact that the ministry is

---

[†] Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Alabama.
Bishop of Athabasca.
Bishop Babcock.
Bishop of Barbados.
Bishop of Blackburn (*Chairman of Sub-Committee* II).
Bishop of Bombay.
Archbishop of Brisbane.
Bishop of Buckingham.
Bishop of Carpentaria.
Bishop of Cashel.
Bishop of Colchester.
Bishop of Coventry.
Bishop of Delaware.
Bishop of Eastern Oregon.
Bishop of George.
Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.
Bishop of Gloucester.*
Bishop of Grahamstown (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Grantham.
Bishop Ivins.
Bishop of Jarrow.
Bishop of Johannesburg.*
Bishop of Kalgoorlie.
Bishop of Keewatin.
Bishop Knight.
Bishop of Manchester (*Chairman of Sub-Committee* I).
Archbishop of Melbourne.*
Bishop of Middleton (*Secretary*).
Bishop Nash.*
Bishop of Natal.
Bishop of Nevada.
Bishop of Newcastle.*
Bishop of Nyasaland.
Bishop of Ottawa.
Archbishop of Perth.
Bishop of Quebec.
Bishop of Saskatchewan.
Bishop of Sherborne (*Secretary*).
Bishop of Singapore.*
Bishop of Southwark.
Bishop Southwell.
Bishop of Stepney.
Bishop of Taunton.
Bishop of Toronto.
Bishop of Travancore and Cochin.
Bishop of Trinidad.
Bishop of Truro.
Bishop of Vermont.
Bishop of Waikato.
Bishop of Wakefield.
Bishop of Western China.
Bishop of Willesden.
Bishop of Willochra.
Bishop of Winchester.*
Bishop of Windward Islands.*
Bishop of Woolwich.
Bishop Wylde (Bathurst).

God's gift through Christ and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church. Hence comes its special privilege as well as its solemn responsibility. Too little emphasis has been placed in the past upon its glory, its call to self-sacrifice and its appeal to the spirit of adventure. The problems which confront the ordained ministry at the present time call for the very best that we can offer and give scope to the very highest gifts that we possess. We venture to believe that if this were realised, most, if not all, of our difficulties with regard to the number of candidates would be overcome. The average healthy-minded youth is more of a hero-worshipper than a lover of money. If we help him to understand the force of a high ambition, the call of a lofty ideal, he will hear the call of Christ and will respond.

II.—Next, we would remind the faithful throughout the world that Our Lord Himself definitely bade us to pray for the increase of the ministry. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth labourers into His harvest." We note with satisfaction that the observance of Embertide has been more widespread and more careful of late years, but it has been our custom in the past to pray for those who are actually being ordained rather than for an increase in their number.

Amongst the additions to the Book of Common Prayer proposed in 1928 was the following prayer, which we commend for general use :—

> "O Almighty God, look mercifully upon the world, which Thou hast redeemed by the blood of Thy dear Son, and incline the hearts of many to offer themselves for the sacred ministry of Thy Church ; so that by their labours Thy light may shine in the darkness, and the coming of Thy Kingdom may be hastened by the perfecting of Thine elect : through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

We think that teaching about the ministry should accompany such prayers as are used both at the Ember seasons and at other times. We think also that careful effort should be made everywhere to make the increase of the ministry the subject of sustained intercession.

III.—The situation with regard to the supply of Ordination candidates has given cause for anxiety in our Communion for many years past. As long ago as 1908 a committee of the Conference considered the question. Since that date the war has accentuated the deficiency that already existed. We do not propose to overload our report with statistics which are of necessity fluctuating. But the following table, referring to England alone, gives the number of men in Holy Orders at the beginning of each of the last 11 years, the estimated number of those who resigned or died during the year, the number ordained and the total at the end of each year :—

| Year. | Total at beginning of year. | Died or resigned (estimated). | Number of Ordinands. | Total at end of year. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1919 | 16,867 | 562 | 161 | 16,466 |
| 1920 | 16,466 | 549 | 258 | 16,175 |
| 1921 | 16,175 | 539 | 346 | 15,982 |
| 1922 | 15,982 | 533 | 392 | 15,841 |
| 1923 | 15,841 | 528 | 463 | 15,776 |
| 1924 | 15,776 | 526 | 436 | 15,686 |
| 1925 | 15,686 | 523 | 371 | 15,534 |
| 1926 | 15,534 | 518 | 363 | 15,379 |
| 1927 | 15,379 | 512 | 393 | 15,260 |
| 1928 | 15,260 | 509 | 385 | 15,136 |
| 1929 | 15,136 | 505 | 439 | 15,070 |

The minds of men have been mainly directed to the falling off in the number of candidates for Holy Orders. We would, on the other hand, recall one most encouraging and striking fact. Since the last Conference no fewer than 1,619 men who served in the Great War have been ordained. The ministry has been greatly strengthened by the addition of this large body of men. Of these candidates 880 were trained with the assistance of the Church. In 1919 it was clearly recognised that "no suitable candidates should be prevented merely for financial reasons from answering the call of God to serve in the sacred ministry." With courageous foresight the Archbishops made this pledge and appealed to the Church. No less a sum than £389,055 was given by Church people to help the cost of training.

At the outbreak of the war there were upwards of 20,000 clergymen at work in England; now, it will be observed, there are but few more than 15,000. To maintain even this reduced number 500 men should be ordained each year, and, if we allow for increase of population at home and increasing opportunity of service overseas the number should be at least 650. In 1919 the number ordained was only 161; the figures then began to rise, and in 1923, when the largest number of those who began their training after war-service was ordained, they rose to 463; they have not been so high since, but last year they reached 439. To put the case in another way, 4,000 men have received Holy Orders since the war, but even to have maintained our position we ought to have had 4,000 more.

These figures relate to England and to missionary dioceses which recruit their ministries from England. So far as we have been able to gather, however, the position set out above is generally true of the whole Communion. It needs no great effort of the imagination to envisage the consequences. It means overwork for the clergy who are conscientiously attempting the impossible, overwork which not only ruins their health, but tends to break their spirit. It means that the flock of Christ is not being fed, as He enjoined. It means that aggressive evangelisation is retarded both at home and abroad.

We are glad to notice that in some of the British Dominions overseas the Church is more and more supplying its own ministry and in some cases in numbers sufficient to meet its needs, and we look forward to a much more extensive interchange of clergy between the Church in England and the diocese overseas.

At the same time, in view of the shortage in England, we express the hope that well-established Churches overseas will increasingly realise that they must depend upon their own men for their own ministry.

IV.—The causes of the decline in the number of Ordination candidates are intimately connected with the general state of the Church and of society. Materialistic tendencies in modern thought and life joined with the loosening of the hold of religion in the home are both the cause and the consequence of the shortage of ordinands. As has been said in the Report of the Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1925, "indifference to the Church and to religion in general is widespread at the present time, creating the atmosphere in which young men grow up and so determining their attitude towards the Church and its ministry." This quotation describes the position in broad outline, but there are certain special factors which seem to us worthy of attention. One, and not the least important amongst them, is that the life and task of the clergyman have not been presented in their true and really attractive character. The petty hardships of the parson's life and the smaller activities of the parish have loomed too large and have to some extent obscured the higher ideal of the ministry. Men have turned to other fields of social service and to other posts of leadership. It is vital that the essential greatness of the work of the ministry should be brought home to the younger generation. This can be done best by personal contact with ordained men who have realised it for themselves, and not least with the younger among them. Part of our task is to win respect for the life and work of the clergyman as such. The clergyman who realises what is involved in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, that it is his task to lead men to God, to help in the building of His Kingdom, to influence the world by the witness of the Church, will create by his life a conception of the ministerial office which will inspire men to hear the call of God to undertake it, much more than by the eloquence of appealing words.

In this connexion we wish to urge the importance of carrying the work and witness of the Church into the midst of those large classes of young men who are not reached by ordinary parochial agencies. It is desirable that a sufficient supply of young clergy should be set free for the work of Toc H padres or for similar non-parochial work, where the need is plain.

Another difficulty, not so widely felt, lies in the region of intellectual misgivings. This difficulty concerns some of those best fitted for the task of the ministry. Science and criticism have disturbed the minds of many men and to some, at least, the quest for truth produces obstacles to the acceptance at an early age of what seem to be cut and dried formulæ. Until the present unsettlement is past, there can be no complete remedy for this state of things. Careful and sympathetic teaching will help to neutralise its influence. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a commission some years ago to consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences. We may look forward with high hope to the report of that commission. Moreover, as we lay emphasis upon spiritual values, doubts and differences tend to disappear. We of the Christian faith should make clear what was expressed by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1922, when it “ recognised the gain which arises from enquiry at once fearless and reverent into the meaning and expression of the faith and welcomed every aid which the thoughtful student finds in the results of sound historical and literary criticism and of modern scientific investigation of the problems of human psychology.”

Finally, there is the financial difficulty, and this we believe to be the most pressing of all. The value of money has changed in recent years with the double result that education is much more costly and that incomes, and not least those of the clergy, do not go as far as they did. Other kinds of useful service are better paid, and attract some who would otherwise be candidates for Holy Orders. Considerations of this kind have especial weight with parents. But recent experience has shown that there is a large number of young men of the right kind who would gladly obey the call to the ministry if it were possible to shoulder the financial burden of training. We are of opinion, and have expressed our opinion in a resolution appended to this report, that it is the duty of the Church as a whole to make provision for them. The Archbishops' appeal on behalf of service candidates proves that this can be done. The Church both in the dioceses and centrally is doing much in this direction, but it has not yet realised that this particular task is a primary obligation on the whole Communion.

## (*b*) THE TRAINING OF CLERGY BEFORE AND AFTER ORDINATION

We welcome the fact that in the present day candidates for Holy Orders are coming from almost every class in the community, and recognise that they have received beforehand an education which varies greatly in quality and character. Moreover, we have to face the fact that the decay of religion in the home and the consequent lack of encouragement on the part of parents have militated against any real religious education for many of our boys. In many schools an effort is being made to remedy this, but we have to admit that this effort is not as widespread as we could wish. We feel, therefore, that there is a special obligation on the clergy, at Confirmation time and afterwards, not only to seek for signs of vocation, but also to guide and help in their preliminary studies those who seem to be called to the ministry. This interest and sympathy on the part of the clergy is equally necessary in the case of those rather older men who have left school for some years and who have been earning their living in some other calling. The parochial clergy can render invaluable service by looking out for and helping in the early stages of their training possible candidates for the ministry. We are of opinion that if this were done as widely as it might be done, the whole problem of supply and training would come nearer to solution.

In our judgment the ideal training for most candidates for Holy Orders is a degree-course in one of our Universities followed by a period of special preparation. We welcome with gratitude the foundation of Universities in our great centres of population and the opportunity for graduating that they provide for large numbers of young men. The Church should be ready to seize the opportunities thus given and should in all possible ways make provision for the spiritual oversight and devotional life of these students. We recommend the establishment of Church hostels as one way by which this need can be met. We are of opinion, however, that, although for most men a University course should be the rule, there are cases, especially among slightly older men, where it is neither practicable nor indeed desirable.

It has long been the custom for a knowledge of both Greek and Latin to be required of those ordained to the sacred ministry. We believe that this knowledge is still of very real value. Owing, however, to recent changes in educational method and the special prominence given to the study of the sciences, it is becoming common for degrees to be awarded without knowledge of both or even one of these languages. In these circumstances, to require a knowledge of both these languages from all Ordination candidates appears to put upon them a burden greater than some of them can bear. We think, however, that as far as possible a sufficient knowledge of Greek to enable a candidate to read the New Testament in that language is of very great importance and that it should only be dispensed with in exceptional cases, particularly in those of older men whose education has been interrupted. With regard to Latin we do not forget the requirement in the Preface to the Ordinal that the candidate should be learned in that tongue, but we believe that the phrase in point meant in the days when the Preface was written that he should have a good general education and that therefore, though in some cases we waive the letter of the requirement, we are in fact preserving its spirit.

Owing to the changes that have taken place in recent years in the arrangement of degree-courses, it is now more easily possible for an undergraduate to spend the first part of his time in reading some subject other than Theology and the latter part in reading that subject. We consider that this plan provides a very valuable course of training in the majority of cases..

We recognise that there is some truth in the impression that the clergy are often out of touch with the life and thought of the laity. We consider that, where it is possible for a candidate to gain some experience of the life and work of the world at home or abroad before Ordination, it will prove of great advantage to his future usefulness.

After the general training there must follow special preparation of the candidate for his life-work as a minister in the Church of God. This involves, in most cases, a period of training at a Theological College. For the graduate we believe that the course at a Theological College should cover at least one year, though we should much like to see that period somewhat extended. In England, if all the existing Colleges were full (and at present this is approximately the case), they would not provide us with the number of ordinands that we need. If at any time it be deemed expedient to add to the number of our Colleges, the new Colleges should be established by the Church itself, preferably in close connexion with a University, should be under the supervision of the Church as a whole, and should each of them have a body of teachers representing the various schools of thought.

For some men residence in a large town parish, or, indeed, in a country vicarage, with an experienced parish priest, might be substituted for the course at a Theological College.

For those candidates who have not obtained a University degree the course of special training should cover three years at a recognised Theological College.

With regard to the training in the Theological College itself we desire to lay emphasis upon the vital importance of the devotional life. This supremely valuable contribution can be made by the Theological College but, broadly speaking, in no other way. Men must be trained in habits of prayer, devotion and discipline ; they must be trained to lead others in prayer and to teach others to pray. They must be taught to think. It is not enough that they should assimilate knowledge ; they must be encouraged to form convictions and to think out problems.

To some extent the curriculum of the College must be governed by the examination that comes at the end of the course, but we need to remember that the students are being prepared for a life rather than for an examination. We should like therefore to lay special stress upon the study of the Bible both critical and devotional. There should then follow Christian doctrine, history, worship, and morals and the principles of pastoral work. To secure the competence of our candidates the General Ordination Examination has been devised and is in operation both in this country and in some of the overseas provinces, while in others similar examinations have come into use. Experience has made it plain that it is dangerous to overload the curricula of our Colleges. It is, however, important that students should be encouraged to take an interest in certain subjects with which they will inevitably be concerned in after life, and to acquire some elementary knowledge of them. Among these subjects we place the art of preaching and teaching, the study of Christian missions, psychology, social economics, elementary anthropology and the problems of race.

We realise that these principles of training require readjustment in different parts of the world, especially when applied to the training of men called to the ministry from primitive races.

It is not the custom in England to require the General Ordination examination to be passed by men over thirty years of age. In our judgment for men of this age formal examinations have very little value; their knowledge and intelligence should be tested in other ways.

We are glad to notice that in many cases the examination for priests' orders is taking less formal shape than in the past. We believe this to be wholly right. Its purpose should be not so much to test the competence of the candidate, which has already been tested, as to encourage him to a real interest in his subject and to further study. In our judgment the deacon should be required to write essays and perhaps to submit himself to oral examination rather than to do set papers.

We would put on record our conviction that the training for the ministry does not end with Ordination to the diaconate. It is the task of the Incumbent to give training in preaching and dealing with souls and in all the duties of the pastoral office to the deacon who has been licensed to him. It is the task of the diocese to give help to its deacons and younger priests. This can be done by retreats, schools for the clergy and "refresher-courses"; it can be done by the formation of guilds of younger clergy; it can be done by the provision of libraries and of access to books; it can also be done, and indeed is being done by the Way of Renewal, to which reference is made in the report of the Committee on the Doctrine of God. We hope that in these and in other ways the work that has been begun in the Theological College may be followed up and extended after ordination.

*Note.*—The position in the United States with reference to the supply and training of the ministry is somewhat different. We therefore append a memorandum drawn up by three Bishops of that Church.

## MEMORANDUM ON THE SUPPLY, TRAINING AND PLACEMENT OF CLERGY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*Note.* 2—This memorandum, drawn up at the request of the Committee, is based entirely on official documents of the Commission on the Ministry, studies made by the Deans of Theological Schools, and the Canon Law of the Episcopal Church.

## SUPPLY

There is a present deficiency in the number of ordinands and an insistent demand for better quality. While in 30 years the number of communicants increased 63 per cent. the number of ordinands actually decreased. We have felt deeply the almost complete cutting off of the supply of ordinands during the period of the war. Conditions of supply vary in different sections of the country, but the problem of quality is generally felt. Nearly one-half of the ordinands were reared in other Christian bodies. Only one-sixth of the present clergy are men under forty years.

### *Causes*

Those commonly recognised :

Questions of finance, before and after ordination : worldly ambition of parents ; popular disregard of Christian leadership : unsettled or uncertain faith : competition of other professions and of other ways of altruistic service : education motivated by material efficiency ; falling birth rate in cultured families which have hitherto furnished the bulk of the clergy : conflict of the new theology with the older and more familiar expressions of faith, and the fact that the new theology has not yet found its emotional appeal, but is still rational and argumentative.

### *Remedies*

To meet this situation the following remedies are being taken :

A National Commission to furnish leadership and inspiration : outstanding clergymen placed in cures that minister to many universities, colleges and important secondary schools : a larger use of the Ember seasons, with special prayers and sermons : deputations of theological teachers and students to colleges and schools for personal contact and conference : conferences on vocation at the numerous diocesan summer camps and schools, Young People's Fellowship, Brotherhood of St. Andrew, and the like : promotion of special conferences on the ministry such as that of St. Paul's School, Concord : wide use of biography and carefully prepared literature appealing to the imagination and sense of high adventure : co-operation with the leaders of the Christian Student Movement.

The chief source of supply is still the consecrated Christian Home and the virile priest whose contagious enthusiasm for Christ is caught by the young men who associate with him. There is also a steadily growing number of older men who find their vocation through successful lay activity.

These measures are already beginning to fill our theological schools with men of excellent quality.

## TRAINING

The standards of learning are carefully fixed by Canon Law, with a very limited discretion allowed the Bishop.

To become a candidate for Holy Orders one must possess a bachelor's degree from a recognised College or University, or be able to pass an examination on the subjects required for such a degree. The degree must include Latin and Greek, English language and literature, general history, mathematics, one natural science, one modern language other than English, one philosophy course, preferably psychology, the Bible in English.

Exception is made in the case of men, over 32 years, who have been successfully engaged in a business or profession and are judged fit in all other ways. A slightly less exacting standard both of previous education and of theological training is required, but men so ordained have restrictions placed on their ministry.

For the Diaconate a candidate must stand successful examination before the Bishop's Chaplains on the following subjects: Contents and interpretation of Holy Scripture, Church History, Christian Missions, Doctrine, Liturgies, Canon Law, Ministrations of a Deacon, including Public Worship, Homiletics, and Religious Education.

For the Priesthood he must pass a further examination on these subjects :—The Bible in English, the New Testament in Greek, Dogmatics and Apologetics, Christian Ethics and Moral Theology, Church Polity, Ministration of the Sacraments, Parish Organisation and Administration, Pastoral Care and one of a long list of Electives.

In rare cases he may be dispensed from Greek.

No cognizance of his Theological School examinations is taken by the diocesan examiners for ordination.

He is expected to spend at least three years of graduate work at an accredited Theological School, most of which are affiliated with Universities. In exceptional cases he may prepare under equally competent private instruction.

The present tendency of most Theological Schools is to give less emphasis to Hebrew, and to present dogmatics and apologetics in relation to modern life: also to give more time to pastoral care, social science, knowledge of the Bible in English, the world-wide outlook and programme of the Church. There is a growing demand for more careful instruction in the preparation and delivery of sermons, and in the rendering of the service.

### PLACEMENT

A question at present most prominently before the mind of the Church in the United States is the placement of the Clergy so as to secure their most effective service to the Church. A preliminary report with recommendations by the National Commission is now being studied by Diocesan authorities for action of General Convention.

Signed { WILLIAM G. McDOWELL, Bishop of Alabama.
WM. P. REMINGTON, Bishop of Eastern Oregon.
PHILIP COOK, Bishop of Delaware.

### (c) VOLUNTARY CLERGY

Your committee was asked to consider the suggestion that men of mature age, of assured position and respected by their fellows, who are loyal churchmen and eager to help, but who should not be required to give up their present occupations, might be called by authority, and, if willing, be ordained to the priesthood. Such men would not supersede the ordinary clergy but would assist the clergyman in charge of a large parish or of a widely scattered area.

The argument for such ordinations is as follows :—The value of the sacraments in the Christian life is increasingly emphasised and appreciated in our Church to-day. We are taught the necessity for communion and for frequent communions ; we are taught that only a priest can consecrate the elements. On the one hand the Church emphasises the necessity of the sacramental life ; on the other there is the fact that hundreds of thousands of Christians of our own and other races are living and, as things are at present, must continue to live almost entirely cut off from the ministry of the Sacraments and largely cut off from the ministry of the Word. This is especially true of isolated groups of Church people in some of the overseas dioceses. It is to meet this need that the discriminating ordination of voluntary clergy is advocated.

Your Committee feel bound to point out that the scheme, though it has much of attractiveness, presents many difficulties. To some it appears contrary to principle. The Priesthood demands the whole of life. To some it appears contrary to long-sustained tradition. Whatever may have been the case in the Apostolic age, it is clear that very soon the Church was guided to adopt a universal system of stipendiary clergy. Moreover, great practical difficulties are urged. These men, though men of education, could receive little or no special training and might tend to become priests who merely celebrated the Sacraments, unable to minister to sick souls, to build up the faithful or evangelise the needy multitude. Experience of the valuable service of Readers and others provides for most of us sufficient answer to this argument. These men would throw a special responsibility upon the Bishop, and he could, both in the selection of them and in his care of them afterwards, guard against this danger.

Other lesser objections are urged. Some of these men ordained for useful service in one place would, in pursuit of their business, move to places where they were not needed. Sometimes their services, even if they stayed in the place of their ordination, would become unnecessary or unacceptable.

The need however is great, and the majority of your Committee believing that there is no valid objection in principle is disposed to recommend the ordination of such men in regional churches where they are needed. Such ordination should be carefully safeguarded. It should be clear that the man has been called of God. The Bishop would take the first step; he should be sure that the clergyman and laity of the district approved of the man in question, and this not only at Ordination, but also if he move from one place to another. He would assure himself of the candidate's worth and character and intelligence. Even then, in our judgment, the number thus ordained should at first be few, that we may know by experience whether it is God's will that thus the flock of Christ be helped. It sometimes is the function of a living Church not to allow itself to be bound by old precedents but to create new ones.

Two smaller points merit brief notice. A certain number of older men who have retired from secular occupations have been ordained of late years with happy results, but these do not come into the category under consideration. Moreover, it has long been the custom for many schoolmasters and University teachers to support themselves by their profession and to render voluntary service in Holy Orders, and this fact suggests that there can be no absolute objection to this principle being extended to other occupations.

It must also be pointed out that if voluntary clergy come into existence, it will be necessary in some parts of the world, and certainly in England, to secure an alteration of the civil law. It would also seem to be necessary that the Exhortation in the Order for the Ordination of priests, and perhaps some other parts of that Order, should be revised.

Your sub-committee desire to make a further suggestion. The growth in the number of communicants and the frequency of acts of communion—a reversion to primitive custom much to be commended—brings in its train a real difficulty in many parishes where the incumbent works alone. He needs help in the administration of the cup in the Holy Communion. Theoretically that ministration has been the task of the deacons of the Church, but it is also true that it has not been universally confined to those in Holy Orders. The majority of the sub-committee therefore recommend, in view of the needs of the day, that the Bishop should have the power to give licences in such cases as he shall approve to a licensed Reader to administer the chalice at the request of the parish priest.

A Report upon so vital a subject as the Ministry must of necessity touch upon many problems. Yet we would above all with thankfulness and confidence declare to all young men and boys that there is no greater or happier work to which men can give their lives than the work of carrying the Gospel of Christ throughout the world, and seeking and shepherding His people. The Church cannot offer comfort or security in earthly things. We know well the poverty and loneliness of the lives of many priests. We also know their faithfulness and courage. Christ, as of old, offers hard tasks to men and calls for great endeavours. Still He summons men to forsake all and follow Him. Still also does He promise His Presence wherever His ministers may go in His Name.

## II

### (*d*) DEACONESSES

In the Lambeth Conference of 1920 considerable space was devoted to what was then called the Restoration of the Order of Deaconesses. A careful report on the whole matter by a Committee presided over by Bishop Chase was accompanied by six resolutions, defining the office, allocating its functions, providing for a form of ordination, and laying down that this is for women the one and only Order of ministry to be recommended for recognition by our branch of the Catholic Church. Thus regulations were proposed for the formal and canonical recognition of a revival that had been hailed with thankfulness by the Lambeth Conference of 1897.

It must, however, be frankly admitted that the hopes underlying this action of 1920 have been but meagrely fulfilled. Our enquiries show us that the number of women asking for ordination as Deaconesses is comparatively small and that far more women of the stamp and qualifications envisaged find scope for their gifts in other ways; that generally speaking there has been little recognition by the Church of the possibilities of the Order; and that such recognition is not appreciably increasing. Moreover, we find a great variety of usage in different parts of our Communion. While the English Convocations have sanctioned a Form and Manner of Making of Deaconesses for use in all English Dioceses, other practices prevail elsewhere; for instance, in the United States of America Deaconesses are "set apart" but not ordained, and the use of the English form of service has deliberately not been adopted; in South Africa and Australia the English form is used, but not formally authorised; the Church in Canada has authorised a form of its own; in India no form has yet been authorised. Corresponding with this variety of ordination or authorisation, there is a difference of status and recognition.

We have, therefore, thought well to reconsider the whole matter, using the report and resolutions of 1920 as our starting point, but not hesitating to give a new content and application to the purpose there shown.

There has risen before us a vision of a great Order of ministry for women, distinct from and complementary to the historic Orders of the Church. This we outline below, in the earnest hope that our vision will be shared by the Church at large.

In our view the slow development of the Order has been partly due to the confusion which has arisen round the term Deaconess. On the one hand, there has been in the past—and to some extent there continues—a very loose use of the word to cover almost any kind of woman worker, in spite of the appeal of the 1897 Conference that the word should be restricted to those formally admitted Deaconess. On the other hand, it has been unfortunate that the Deaconess should be thought to be the female equivalent of the existing Deacon, *i.e.*, identical in character and perhaps also in status with the third Order of the Ministry.

We desire on the contrary to affirm that the Order of Deaconess is an Order *sui generis*: the only Order of ministry open to women, but an Order which both from the solemnity of its ordination and the importance of its functions can satisfy the fullest desires of women to share in the official work of the Church. This may be thought to be a departure from primitive practice, but the times have changed, and though we value historical precedents, we do not think that they need entirely restrict us in our endeavour to enlist the great gifts and special contribution of women to the varied and immense needs of the Church to-day.

Once the principle is accepted that the Order of Deaconess is not simply an equivalent of the Order of Deacon, the way is open for a new consideration of the status, functions and possible development of the Order, and it is in the light of this principle that we desire our recommendations to be considered.

We strongly urge that for the future the term Deaconess should be wholly restricted to those formally ordained to this office.

We desire that some such form of making Deaconesses as is now used in England should become universal, and should be recognised throughout our Communion as a real ordination, but in our appended resolutions we no longer advise the delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop, as we are informed that such a modification will make for unity throughout the Churches of our Communion and will also tend to remove a cause of confusion between the Deacon and the Deaconess.

We consider that each Province should as soon as possible determine, in accordance with local requirements, such questions as the conditions of training, the intellectual standards required, and the age of ordination; and that all candidates should be accepted by a Diocesan Bishop before or during their training; that all those ordained should take an Oath of Canonical Obedience and make a Declaration of Assent, and receive Letters of Orders, being ordained to a title, parochial or other; and should always work under licence from the Bishop. Since the Church is morally responsible for the future of the Deaconess, the Bishop should satisfy himself with regard to the prospects of her health, her employment, and her remuneration, including provision for a pension. When ordained her name should be entered on the diocesan roll of ordained ministers and it would be for Provinces and Dioceses to decide how best to relate this fact to membership of official and synodical bodies. Conditions vary in different regions of our Communion, but we desire that, in whatever way is fitting and practicable, Deaconesses should have proper representation on the constitutional bodies of the Church.

We repeat the Resolution 49 of 1920 that no vow or implied promise of celibacy should be required as necessary for admission to the Order. We believe that there is a real place for married Deaconesses and much special and valuable work that they can do. We are convinced that it would be a serious loss to the Church and to the Order if this were not recognised both among Deaconesses themselves and in the Church at large. None the less, a Deaconess must be at liberty either as an individual or as a member of a community to take a vow of celibacy.

We have had before us from various quarters an urgent plea for the admission of women to the Priesthood. In part this is an issue of the movement, the permanence of which has not yet been proved by time, to secure for women both equality of opportunity and similarity of function with men in every department of life, but in part it arises from an intense desire to serve the Church with the Grace that admission to the Priesthood would bring. In view of the position and character of some of those who have pressed this matter upon us we have given earnest consideration to it. We think a fuller answer is needed on the theological side than that given in 1920, and we should welcome such a statement. We do not think that this is the place or occasion for full discussion. A majority of the sub-committee believes that there are theological principles which constitute an insuperable obstacle to the admission of women to the Priesthood, apart from all considerations of expediency. Others who do not agree with them on the matter of principle see grave difficulties of a practical nature in the way of such admission.

In some senses the times in which we live are new, and there are opportunities for women's service as well as a supply of qualified women to undertake them unparalleled in the past. In view, however, of the reasons indicated above, we do not think that the new conditions demand a departure from the universal custom of the Catholic Church, and therefore we cannot encourage in any way those who press for the Priesthood of Women. On the contrary, we are bold to say that in the Order of Deaconess as we see it, and as we hope it will develop, there is scope, as there is need, for the exercise of women's ministry within the commissioned Orders of the Church of such a kind as to satisfy the highest aspirations; and we believe that Almighty God, whose Providence is leading the Church to this step, will give through the Laying on of Hands the measure of Grace which will enrich and uplift the service which His ordained daughters will contribute. We earnestly desire that clergy and laity alike will do all in their power to welcome and extend this ministry.

### *Special Commissions*

We are impressed with the fact that there are women, whether Deaconesses or not, who have special gifts of spiritual or intellectual kinds which are not now being fully used by the Church. We desire that Bishops should be willing to give to such women special commissions, either permanent or temporary, to give addresses, to conduct retreats, or to give spiritual counsel, for we are convinced that there is need for official authorisation for such prophetical and spiritual powers.

### *Lay-Workers*

We welcome the progress made during the past few years in training and organisation, both central and diocesan, for lay women-workers. There is always a danger that the worker, especially if she be not highly equipped, may become isolated and parochial in outlook. Often it is not recognised by her incumbent that she needs for herself that help, intellectual and spiritual, which she endeavours to give to others. There is abundant evidence that if this is provided for her by some diocesan authority, which concerns itself with the provision of lectures, study-circles, retreats, social intercourse, as well as with questions of pay, pensions and conditions of employment, she welcomes such friendly interest and her work is immensely strengthened. We do not want to overstress the importance of central or diocesan councils, but we are clear that some organisation of the kind is necessary if the standard and well-being of the woman-worker, especially in parochial work, is to be safeguarded.

We desire to emphasise that all paid workers should receive an adequate stipend together with a place in a recognised pension scheme, and work under a formal agreement which specifies terms of employment, including time for study and devotion and provision for holidays.

Here we would call attention to the immense amount of admirable and self-sacrificing work done by voluntary and part-time workers, especially in country and scattered areas, sometimes without much encouragement or spiritual assistance. That service of one kind or another is an essential part of Christian discipleship is indeed clear, and to that degree the workers we have in mind are examples to all. Nevertheless it is true that their offering of mind or spirit would often be larger and deeper if means were taken to help them to gain the knowledge, vision and insight that they need.

Excellent work is being done by Women Messengers. In this movement women of education, most of whose time is otherwise occupied, devote some weeks during the year to particular work under the immediate direction of the Bishop, *e.g.*, preparation for a parochial mission, pastoral work in a newly developed area, or some special campaign. We are sure that every Diocese has need of such a band of women, and we should like to see the movement growing both at home and overseas.

The Church has no more valuable asset than its women-workers, paid and voluntary, both at home and abroad; they deserve all the help we can give them, and a full measure of recognition. But there is need for more such service. Many women to-day hardly regard the service of the Church as a possible sphere for their gifts and capacities: commerce, politics, medicine, law, education and other careers attract them instead. That they can give God service in such walks of life goes without saying, but we would ask them to consider whether the organised life of the Church does not need their help still more.

We hope and believe that many women will answer to the call, when it is clear that there is proper scope and real opportunity for the service they can render. Such scope and opportunity we have attempted through the recommendations of this Report to secure, but the primary need on all sides is a larger vision of what Church-work is and should be, together with a clearer sense of vocation.

### (*e*) SPIRITUAL HEALING

This matter was carefully considered by a Committee of the Lambeth Conference in 1908, and again in 1920, when Resolution 63 requested the appointment of a Committee "to consider and report upon the use with prayer of the Laying on of Hands, of the Unction of the Sick, and other spiritual means of healing." This Committee duly reported in a booklet called "The Ministry of Healing," published by the S.P.C.K. in 1924, and we earnestly commend it as outlining the right attitude of the Church towards this matter. We quote in particular (pp. 18 and 19) the following sections :—

> "The Church must sanction methods of religious treatment of bodily disease, but in doing so must give full weight to the scientific discoveries of those who are investigating the interrelation of spirit, mind, and body. It is not the function of the Church to apply its means of restoration if no higher end is sought than the recovery of bodily health. Indeed, to do this would gravely compromise the meaning and purpose of the Church's rites and sacraments. No sick person must look to the clergyman to do what it is the physician's or surgeon's duty to do.
>
> "Whatever the means employed by the Church emphasis should be laid upon the primary purpose of deepening the sense of fellowship with God secured for us in Jesus Christ. Whether the sick person throw off the sickness or not, the work of the Church will have been effective if he has thereby found truer peace of spirit and a more real knowledge of the uplifting presence and power of Christ."
>
> And again, "Whilst religious methods are applicable to all cases of sickness, they would seem to be most appropriate where moral or intellectual difficulties and perplexities have contributed to the disorder. These deep-lying roots of evil should be dealt with before any specifically bodily healing is attempted ; otherwise we shall be in danger of dealing with symptoms and neglecting causes ; in which case no thorough or permanent cure can be hoped for."

Just as on the one hand there is a common tendency to ignore the relation between spiritual and physical and to forget that moral and spiritual treatment is often at least as necessary as medical and surgical treatment, so on the other hand we must beware of the danger of equating sin and disease as parallel disorders of life.

We venture to suggest that the problem of temptation offers a useful analogy. Temptation is undoubtedly an evil, and we are bidden by Our Lord to pray for escape from it ; nevertheless, all humanity, not excepting Our Lord Himself, has been subject to it, and sometimes it appears to be God's will that we should continue to suffer it, and, indeed, count such suffering as a joy. Similarly disease of various kinds is a liability of the human race, and in itself an evil against which Our Lord encourages us to fight ; yet we cannot doubt that at times full harmony with the will of God consists rather in suffering that exalts and purifies than in restoration of physical health.

Apart from such questions, we conceive it to be our duty only to emphasise certain important points.

(1) In view of the constant interrelation of body and spirit we press for a growing co-operation between doctors and clergy. Each has his own special field, and each needs to recognise and welcome the contribution of the other. We think that there is a real need for the clergy to study the principles of moral theology and of psychology, but not so much in order that they may use gifts of healing as that they may thereby the better execute their primary duty of spiritual assistance.

(2) Where spiritual healing is practised, it should always be in close and vital conjunction with prayer and the spiritual preparation of the individual concerned, and wherever possible the doctor should be associated with this ministry.

(3) On account of the immense importance that we attach to the spiritual preparation of the individual, as well as for other reasons, we are not prepared to give any encouragement to public Missions of Healing.

(4) We urge that in every parish there should be regular intercessory prayer by groups of people, both in order to help sufferers and to promote a right spiritual and mental attitude towards sickness and health.

(5) We welcome the existence in England, in consequence of the Report referred to above, of a permanent committee of clergy and doctors to deal with Spiritual Healing and we look forward to much wise guidance from its experience.

### (*f*) RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

The Committee has had referred to it the Resolution of the

Lambeth Conference of 1897 on this subject, together with the subsequent Report of 1898 which was ordered to be circulated in 1908, with a request that each Province should send a statement of its judgment to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Very few replies have been directly received, but action is being taken in England by Regulations lately drawn up, and by Canons passed by the Church of the United States of America and by the Church of India in its new Constitution.

The Committee therefore begs leave to report as follows :—

Throughout the Anglican Communion there have been considerable developments both in the numbers and in the characteristics of Religious Orders both of men and women during the past 33 years since this subject was formally and fully before the Lambeth Conference, and we record our thankfulness for this evidence of spiritual power. Varying much in details of organisation and method of work, Religious Communities have this in common, that they are bodies of devout persons who have given their lives in complete sacrifice as a supreme act of worship to God and for His immediate service. They represent a spiritual energy showing itself in a consecration of the whole life with all its powers to the Glory of God and the benefit of His Church, and they are therefore deserving of special thought and wise recognition by the authorities of the Church which they serve. There has been, in consequence of the growth referred to, an increased experience of the problems which are involved. There is the more need, therefore, for the sake both of the Church and of the Communities, that the inter-relation between the two should be clarified and strengthened. We believe that the time has now come when the Episcopate, recognising the value of community life and work within the Church, should be prepared to give formal sanction to approved Communities, and when the Communities themselves will welcome such sanction.

We therefore make the following suggestions, which are designed to indicate the lines on which such mutual relations between the Episcopate and the Religious Communities may be brought into being and made more effective :—

A.—Every Community to be approved must have a Rule. The Rule, by which term we mean all the governing documents, must have received such sanction as the Province shall determine.

B.—The following provisions should be included in the Rule :—

I. *The Visitor*

Every Community to be approved must have a Visitor, who shall be chosen by the Community, and shall be—

(*a*) the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Mother-House is situated ; or

(*b*) with the consent of the Diocesan, a Bishop of the Province ; or

(*c*) with the sanction of the Diocesan and Metropolitan (or some cognate ecclesiastical authority of the place concerned), some other Bishop.

II. *The Duty of the Visitor*

(*a*) He shall visit the Community in person, or by deputy, at regular intervals.

(*b*) He shall see that its Rule, Constitution or other governing regulations and statutes are observed.

(*c*) He shall hear any appeal which may arise from any member of the Community.

III. *The Sanction of the Visitor is to be required—*

(*a*) for any change in the Rule, unless such sanction is reserved by provincial regulation to the Episcopal Synod.

(*b*) for any profession involving permanent vows.

(*c*) for any dispensation from such vows.

(*d*) for any expulsion from the Community.

(*e*) for the election of the Head of the Community.

IV. The approval of the Visitor, in the case where he is the Diocesan, shall be required for all services held in the chapels or churches of the Order in his Diocese, and for services other than those connected with the Holy Communion outside it.

If the Visitor should not be the Diocesan, his sanction will suffice for the choir Offices and others not connected with the Holy Communion: but the sanction of the Diocesan of the Diocese in which any House is situated shall always be required for all matters connected with the Holy Communion, and for any other services to which the general public is admitted.

V. *The Diocesan*

The licence of the Diocesan is required—

(*a*) for the Church or Chapel of the Community, and he shall lay down rules as to the attendance of those, other than resident guests, who do not belong to the Community.

(*b*) by the Chaplain and any priest ministering in the Community.

(*c*) by any member of the Community in Holy Orders, who, if he officiates in some other Diocese, must hold such permission as is usual from the Bishop of that Diocese.

VI. Apart from the visitatorial right and duty of the Visitor of an Order, every Diocesan shall retain his right of visiting as Diocesan any Community House which is situated in his Diocese in regard to the matters for which he has responsibility, and generally of making thorough inquiry if he is not satisfied as to the position, conduct, or work of the Community.

VII. A Community House may not be established in any Diocese without the permission of the Diocesan.

VIII. There shall be no appeal beyond the Visitor unless any matter is in dispute between the Visitor and the Diocesan. Any such question shall be referred to the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province.

IX. The Rule of every approved Community should contain—

(*a*) a distinct recognition that the doctrine and discipline of the Church, as received by the Province and Diocese in which the Community serves, is binding on its members.

(*b*) regulations as to the holding and disposal of property as it concerns the Community corporately and its members individually.

These suggestions are far from being exhaustive, but they seem to embody the main points to be safeguarded in the mutual relations of the Communities and the Episcopate.

The growth of Religious Communities, both active and contemplative, has been so marked a feature of Church life during the past years, that it seems probable that it will still continue. While in no way desirous therefore of attempting to limit the natural expansion of a movement which derives its energy from the Spirit of God, the Committee feels that the multiplication of Communities is undesirable unless the purpose is to provide for variations from existing types, either in work, rule or theological outlook.

We are convinced that the Church, while emphasizing the dignity of vocation in its widest sense, should bring before Church people the fact that God may be calling many of varying attainments and gifts to consecrate themselves to His service in a corporate life of dedication.

Further, an Advisory Council possessing the confidence of the Episcopate and of the Religious Communities might prove of great value in dealing with the many technical matters which arise from time to time. Such a Council might well encourage incipient Communities to work patiently up to the point of formal approval and recognition.

(Signed) F. R. GRAHAMSTOWN,
*Chairman.*

## No. VI

# YOUTH AND ITS VOCATION

## I

We[†] desire at the outset to protest emphatically against the contention that the Youth of to-day are, as a whole, less moral or less religious than youth of previous generations. On the contrary, we see on all sides most encouraging signs in their responsiveness, their interest in good causes, their passionate desire for social justice and their humanity, which often shows itself in acts of sacrifice and service. All the world over they are taking a conscious and active part in the great movements of the time to an extent which perhaps has never been equalled before. There are also signs of a great intellectual stirring among the rising generation. We sympathise with, and are eager to enter into the intellectual, moral and religious difficulties with which they are faced in a new world where moral standards and religious principles are openly criticised and widely disputed. Especially we note the difficulty which many of them find in reconciling the impersonal and mechanical interpretation of the world in which they live with the Christian revelation which they sincerely desire to accept if they can do so with reality.

---

[†] Names of Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Armidale.*
Bishop of Barking.
Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness.
Bishop of Bath and Wells.
Bishop of Bathurst.
Bishop of Bloemfontein.
Bishop of Brandon.
Bishop of British Columbia.
Bishop of Caledonia.
Bishop of Chelmsford.
Bishop of Connecticut.
Bishop of Christchurch.
Bishop of Crediton.
Bishop of Croydon.
Bishop of Dover.*
Bishop of Easton.
Bishop of Edmonton.
Bishop Embling.
Bishop of Ely.
Bishop of Hankow.
Bishop Hobson.
Bishop of Kansas.*
Bishop of Kilmore.
Bishop of Kyoto.
Bishop of London (*Chairman*).
Bishop of Malmesbury.
Bishop of Mauritius.
Bishop of Nasik.
Bishop of New Hampshire.
Bishop of Newark.
Bishop of North Queensland.
Bishop of North West Australia.
Bishop of Ossory.
Bishop of Portsmouth.
Bishop of Pretoria.*
Bishop of Ripon.
Bishop of Riverina.
Bishop of Rockhampton.
Bishop of St. Albans.
Bishop of St. David's.
Bishop Scarlett.
Bishop of Sherborne.*
Bishop of Sodor and Man.
Bishop Roberts.
Bishop of South Western Virginia.
Bishop of Southern Rhodesia.
Bishop of Stafford.
Bishop of Swansea and Brecon.
Bishop of Texas.
Bishop of Whitby (*Secretary*).

In common with older men and women Youth is frankly bewildered by the many perplexing problems of the day and the challenge which these problems seem to make to the very reality of God and the foundations of all morality.

In our view, a great deal of exaggerated language has been used about the " Revolt of Youth," but it must be admitted that a not inconsiderable section is alienated from the Church and all organised religion.

In our enquiries we have confined our attention to those between the age of fourteen and twenty-five, and we are assured that the problem is equally urgent in all parts of the world. In addition to our own experience we have had the advantage of interviews with a number of representatives of different forms of work amongst the young, including the Universities, naval and military services, schools, and organised movements for the material, moral, and spiritual welfare of youth.

It will readily be agreed that the present situation is largely caused by the upheaval of the Great War. Post-war developments are by no means wholly to be deplored. The abandonment of artificial conventions, freedom from over-strict discipline, reasonable independence and self-reliance, a frank comradeship between the sexes and the new opportunities afforded to women for taking part in the world's work—all these may be welcomed, but they bring with them dangers which cannot be disregarded. A new outlook due to changing conditions may lead, and indeed to some extent has led, to defiance of authority and moral sanctions, and a repudiation of principles which are essential to the welfare of society, domestic and national. Increased facilities for transport, cheap entertainment and a higher standard of living, while good in themselves, may easily encourage the young to put pleasure and excitement in the forefront of their plan of life.

There can be no doubt that the general outlook of Youth, and not Youth only, is injuriously affected by a certain type of literature, journalism and public exhibitions which pander to the lower instincts of human nature, destroy the nobler ideals of love and married life and tend to undermine the foundations of sexual morality and human happiness. This is especially true in the case of the published works of certain authors whose recognised ability and position give undue weight to views on the relations of the sexes which are in direct conflict with Christian principles.

Next we would stress the deplorable influence of economic pressure. Housing conditions in many towns and villages make it almost impossible for a large section of young people (though there are glorious exceptions) to preserve their self-respect and to escape contamination from demoralising surroundings, and tend to crush God out of their lives. Moreover, the uncertainty of earning a living and fears for the future in the fierce competition of the modern social order lead many to concentrate upon the material aspect of life and leave little room for interest in the spiritual values of goodness, beauty and truth.

It would be hard to exaggerate the demoralising effect of the present unprecedented scale of unemployment in which Youth is to a considerable extent involved. This is a world-wide calamity. To take the case of England alone, a large proportion of those who leave school have no prospect of permanent employment or are compelled to undertake temporary or blind-alley jobs. Thus they find that at a most critical age their powers, instead of being developed in preparation for a life of useful and happy work, are running to waste. Loss of self-respect and of a sense of responsibility inevitably follows. Enforced idleness leads to incapacity for work, and at the same time fosters a spirit of bitterness.

Many modern developments have contributed to the disintegration of home life and the consequent weakening of parental authority. The increased facilities for travelling and cheap local entertainment encourage this detachment from home, while more and more responsibility is removed from parents by the intervention of the State in the affairs and interests of the young. In some parts of the Dominions and of the United States of America this intervention is described as practically removing school children from the influence of the home and the Church.

Evidence goes to prove that in many, though by no means in all cases, the young fail to find in organised Church life the spirit of welcome and fellowship which should be a characteristic of the Christian society. They are also quick to notice any inconsistency between the daily life and the religious profession of Churchpeople. When they attend Church the services often seem to them unreal, formal and unsatisfying; they question the sincerity of the preacher especially when dealing with controversial subjects; and they fail to find in the teaching which they hear the answers to the problems of faith, morals and practice which are exercising their minds.

There is no doubt that an additional barrier between the best of the Youth of to-day and organised religion is the unchristian and bitter party spirit which so often obscures the underlying unity of the Body of Christ.

There is also the conviction that their elders have not been successful in making a better world, and are therefore mainly responsible for the difficulties with which the rising generation is confronted.

## II

If our view of the situation is correct, we must now examine the methods which the Church should adopt in order to counteract the tendencies which raise barriers between the Church and Youth.

It seems to us of the first importance that the clergy and other leaders should make a study of the present outlook of Youth, both generally, and particularly in their own parishes; and should bear in mind that for most of their younger parishioners the Great War is only a faint and uncertain memory, that they find themselves living in a world which has undergone a complete transformation from the conditions in which their elders were brought up; that they feel uncertain and bewildered both as to moral values and religious principles, and that they are looking for guidance to those whose teaching offers definiteness, reality and sincerity. If they do not find this in the Church they will seek it elsewhere.

This leads us to refer to that large class of young people whose religious instinct has found expression in certain organisations which are essentially religious, but have no connection with institutional Christianity. Such people have a real enthusiasm for social reform and for aiding those less fortunate than themselves, but they have at best only a precarious association with any form of organised religion. We are convinced that the Church has much to learn from the vigour, enthusiasm and the spirit of fellowship which are characteristic of such movements. We are equally convinced that the Church has much to contribute to the full development of all that is best in them.

The existing organisations within the Church, which are too well known to require mention here, have done splendid work in dealing with Youth, and it is the duty of parochial clergy to use and maintain them.

We also believe that it is the duty of the Church to study other (Christian) Youth movements, which attract because they seem to meet the present needs.

We have been impressed with the evidence given to us (which accords with our own knowledge of the situation) by the representatives of the Headquarters of the Scout Movement, which owes its phenomenal success to its appeal to the imagination and aspiration of Youth.

A definite request has been made to the Lambeth Conference through this Committee for that help which the Church can, if it will, give to this, and to the Girl Guide Movement, in order to strengthen and develop the religious basis of their work, and to assist them to maintain their high ideal of loyalty to God and brotherhood among all nations of the world, irrespective of colour or creed.

This appeal we commend to the most serious consideration of the Church, believing that it ought to be met with generous and sympathetic response in every country where these movements are at work.

Similar appeals for the help of the Church have been made to us by representatives of the Students' Christian Movement and Toc H. In view of the very special and international work which the S.C.M. is doing to present to the students of the world the claims of Christ, and to encourage the serious study of the Faith, we believe that it has a claim upon all the help which the Church can give. There is no doubt in our minds that Toc H is appealing to and developing the spirit of fellowship, service and sacrifice in an increasing number of younger men in England and overseas. Nothing, we believe, but good can result from closer co-operation of the Church with this movement.

It must be understood that special circumstances have occasioned the reference to the particular movements mentioned above. Had the limits of this Report allowed it, we would gladly have borne witness to the value and importance of the work done by other movements and societies in many parts of the world.

It is also desirable that where possible clergy and leaders should interest themselves and take an active part in social welfare work, both civic and national, amongst the young.

But while such movements may be effective, it will always be the personal influence within or without which produces permanent results. How such personal relationship between clergy and the young can be established in large populations is a problem the solution of which is of extreme difficulty. We desire to express our profound appreciation of the heroic efforts of the clergy in large parishes to cope with this difficulty. But we believe that the ultimate solution lies in the method adopted by Our Lord, of working from the centre outwards—to which we refer later. In smaller country parishes this personal contact and influence between the parish priest and his people, young and old, is possible, but even here, and certainly in town parishes where the population is often overwhelmingly large, we believe that the only hope lies in following Our Lord's method by working from the centre outwards, by selecting those most capable of leading and by teaching and training them in the missionary spirit so that they may go out and bring others to Christ.

And while it is claimed that the youth of the present day are unwilling to accept authoritative statements from scripture or teachers, there is one influence which retains as great a power as ever, namely, the personal example of the Christian who believes and practises what he teaches.

We believe that the battle for the heart and conscience of modern youth must be fought by the Church to-day on three fronts at least—intellectual, spiritual and practical.

In a seemingly impersonal world the Church must vindicate personality, and in particular proclaim the personality and fatherhood of God, as the source and support of all life and the supreme ruler of the universe.

Against much that is determinist and ultimately pessimistic in modern psychology the Church must demonstrate the power of Christ to unify the disconnected and warring elements of human personality into a direct harmony of thought and action. It must go out to Youth as a herald of a power from on high, as a champion of the ideals of brotherhood and service, as the teacher of those values of life without which no people or age can prosper, and the dispenser by the grace of God of those sacraments of life that are vital to all true and fruitful living.

Towards the attainment of both these ends the Church must recover and vitalise its teaching ministry in Church, school, and home.

We believe that as it is our conduct as much as our message that is called in question, the Church must vindicate in the eyes of Youth the power of religion to transform our present acquisitive society into one in which the principles of Christ will be triumphantly expressed. Equally important is the expression of our teaching in terms of modern thought if Youth is to be won; the application of the Gospel to the needs of modern life; and more evidence of resolute determination on the part of the Church to put first things first. Youth waits impatiently for definite leadership from the Church, particularly (*a*) in the making and the use of money and (*b*) in regard to war.

We believe that Youth of this generation is sound at heart. It has admittedly struck its tents and is on the march, and though it does not always know in which direction it is moving, it is looking for leaders and will follow them if they give a lead which is both sane and daring.

It is impossible to leave this part of our subject without some direct reference to the unique opportunity of influencing the young which Confirmation offers to the clergy of our Church. Here we find a number of young people placing themselves at a most impressionable age in the hands of their parish priest for a long period of definite and consecutive Church teaching, generally in classes, but with constant opportunities for personal interviews and guidance. It is impossible to exaggerate the value of such systematic preparation when it is made clear that the renewal of Baptismal vows means a deliberate offering of the young life to the service of Christ, Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life—in other words, a real, though not necessarily sensational, " Conversion "—and the special gift of the Holy Spirit is represented as the " ordination of the laity " to a ministry of witness, loyalty and service, conferring divine strength to resist evil and choose good and opening the door to the life-giving sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

But the Church must acknowledge and deplore the fact that in spite of the multitude of candidates confirmed year after year, there is no proportionate increase in the number of regular Communicants, or even of convinced and loyal Church members. We fully appreciate the methods which are widely adopted for keeping the confirmed in close touch with the Church, such as Communicants' Classes, Guilds, Fellowships, Clubs, but statistics and experience alike prove that no complete remedy has been found.

We are of opinion that Confirmation in all its aspects and possibilities might well be the subject of an exhaustive inquiry by the authorities of the Church with a view to providing guidance for the clergy as to the preparation and after-care of candidates, and examining the value of suggestions for improvement which are the outcome of personal experience in widely differing conditions.

## III

The very first business of the Church is to bring God to man and man to God; to be a channel through which the Divine life and love may flow out into the world. The discharge of this tremendous task belongs in the first instance to the realm of conduct. The only finally convincing argument for Christianity is a spectacle of the Christian values translated into terms of human life. Side by side with the force of Christian example should be placed the work of Christian teaching. In laying special emphasis on this part of the Church's duty we would appeal to the practice and methods of Our Lord Himself. He came to teach the true ideas of God and man, and to demonstrate the life which was the outcome of the ideas which He taught. He taught religion. The present bewilderment which is especially characteristic of the younger generation, and largely due to the widespread attacks upon Christian faith and morals, can, we believe, only be solved by the Church being more faithful to Our Lord's commission. This aspect of the subject is fully dealt with in the Report of the Committee on the Doctrine of God which we commend to the careful study of all, both clergy and laity, who are called upon to teach and lead the young.

This involves the necessity that those who are called to teach should think out afresh, in full view of the knowledge of our day and in view of the special difficulties with which Youth is faced, the meaning of our faith and the significance of Christian experience in its application to present-day problems.

The best of the younger generation in every section of the community, and in every country of the world, are not seeking a religion that is watered down or robbed of the severity of its demands, but a religion that will not only give them a sure basis and an ultimate sanction for morals, but also a power to persevere in reaching out after the ideal which in their heart of hearts they recognise as the finest and the best.

The Church, then, if it is to be faithful to the commission and the example of its Divine Head, must provide for the systematic and continuous teaching of the Christian faith and life to its members—young and old—and to all who are seeking for a religion that works. To meet this demand such teaching must be directed to the reason as well as to the heart and conscience and will. It must present Christ, not only as the Way of living, but as the Revelation of the true ideas of God and man of which that life is the outcome. It must present Christ not only as the Way and the Truth, but as the Life—the source of that spirit and power which alone will enable those who give themselves to Him to live their lives in His way. It never has been and certainly is not to-day sufficient to exhort people to be good ; the demand which Youth is making of the Church is to teach them *how* to be good. More attention therefore should be given to teaching the art of prayer and communion with God.

Further, it is only in the reality of Christian fellowship that the younger generation will find themselves. We would therefore stress the vital importance of making such fellowship within the Church a reality to them.

Last, but not least, if the Christian faith is to appeal to the best of Youth to-day, it must be presented in its world-wide claim, recognising Christ as the one solution of all the problems of life, individual, social, economic, industrial, national and international. Free inquiry and frank discussion among themselves on matters of religious faith and morals is characteristic of the rising generation of to-day, while "no impression without expression" is a sound principle of all education. It is, in our opinion, therefore, essential that in teaching Christian faith and life methods should be adopted which will provide opportunity for self-expression on the part of those who learn. Recent experience gained in missionary schools, in schools of prayer and in other efforts to give definite and continuous instruction in the faith to different groups of people, has shown that this method of following instruction by group discussions and conferences is really effective.

Further, we would recall the Church to the method which Our Lord Himself adopted to attain the object for which He became incarnate. He went about doing good, healing the sick, comforting the sorrowful, and cheering the lonely; He preached to the multitudes, He challenged thought, He cast His net wide and far; but the major portion of His time seems to have been spent in teaching and training by personal contact with Himself the few whom He selected from the crowd who heard Him, in order that He might send them out to bring others in. He worked from the centre outwards. We are convinced that it is only in faithful obedience to this method that the Church will ever win to Christ either the young or the old. This is especially true in the larger centres of population; here the clergy are gallantly attempting with utterly inadequate staffs an impossible task; they are seeking to make personal contact with that large number of men and women, and boys and girls within their parishes, but outside the influence of any form of organised Christianity. But it cannot be done except through a large body of workers who have themselves been trained to be missionaries to their own people. The teaching and training of this nucleus in each parish to be missionaries of the faith to young and old should, we believe, be the first concern of the parochial clergy.

Inasmuch as nothing can take the place of home influence, it is vital that parents should have the opportunity of learning how to teach the Christian faith and life to their children. We welcome the efforts that are now being made to provide such opportunities through various schemes for the religious education of the adult.

The training of the clergy in the art and technique of teaching is an urgent need. Educational authorities do not offer positions in schools, even to "born teachers," unless the applicant can produce evidence of training in methods of teaching. It would be an immense advantage to the Church if all candidates for ordination were required to attend a course of simple instruction on the elementary principles and methods by which knowledge is imparted to others.

Of great importance is the training of leaders of Youth. Many such leaders realise their responsibilities in this direction, but confess that they do not know how to impart to those under their charge the Faith by which they try to guide their own lives. In some dioceses endeavours have been made to meet this need by inviting leaders to conferences and quiet week-ends for purposes of discussion, united prayer and simple instruction in the Faith.

We do not feel called upon in this Report to say more on the subject of teachers in Day and Sunday Schools than that we heartily endorse the generally accepted conclusion that all teachers of religion should not only believe what they undertake to teach but should also be properly trained to teach what they believe. In view of the increased efficiency of the teaching of secular instruction in Day Schools, the training and equipment of Sunday School teachers and the adoption of up-to-date methods of organisation have become increasingly important.

Attention should also be called to the experiments of Sunday School by post which have met with marked success in sparsely populated districts.

We have made inquiry as to the permanent results of religious teaching in schools. Evidence goes to show that however conscientious and careful the religious instruction in school days may have been, the impression made is not strong enough to keep young men and women faithful to Church obligations, including Sunday observance, in the new surroundings and difficulties of later life. The religious temperature is described as falling many degrees in the new atmosphere of University life.

In our opinion it is desirable that trained and qualified priests should be appointed for work amongst students especially in such universities as do not provide officially for religious instruction.

## IV

This Report is presented to the Lambeth Conference and is addressed to the whole Church. Where it is critical, the criticism is directed towards the Church rather than towards Youth. We elders are ready enough to admit our share in the causes which have led to such estrangement as exists, and to do all that lies in our power to heal the breach. But the Church not only includes the young, but depends upon them for co-operation in the immediate fulfilment of its mission to the world, and more important still, in the moulding of the character and outlook of the succeeding generation. Youth responds readily to the social appeal and will recognise that its responsibility for right judgment in all things is not limited to a solution of its own personal problems but extends to the influence which it must exert upon the lives of those who come after.

Youth is called to take its part in the task of making the world a better place. This is Youth's Vocation. The claim of the Church is that the only solution of the problems which confront the world to-day is the Christian Faith, taught and understood and believed and practised; that the strongest factor in the conflict of right against wrong is the witness of lives lived in Christ at home and abroad, and that this witness can be and is being borne by men and women whatever department of the world's work they may represent, civil or military, commercial or industrial, literary or artistic, public or private.

But while Vocation must be recognised and fulfilled in every honourable walk of life, the word itself has a special significance as a call from God to active personal service for Christ and His Church. The World Call to the Church proclaimed at once the greatness of our opportunity for winning the world for Christ and the inadequacy of our response to the appeal for living agents, for missionaries, doctors, nurses and teachers.

Simultaneously, the work of the Church is crippled by the shortage of clergy.

This fact constitutes a direct challenge to the younger men of to-day when facing the question of what their life's work shall be—to ask themselves, not " Why should I ? " but " Why should I *not* be ordained ? " It is a man's job. There is no work in the world which makes greater demands on the best that any man can give. There is no human quality which it does not need or cannot use to the full, whether physical, intellectual, moral or spiritual. In the width of its outlook, as in the bigness of its task, it stands alone ; it touches life at every point ; there is no concern of man which is outside its ken ; like the symbol of its faith it reaches out to embrace all life and every bit of it, down to the very depths of sin and human degradation and up into the infinite love of the Heart of God. Its idealism is in the clouds, but its feet walk on the common paths of men.

To any man who has the stuff in him to take the trouble to fit himself for the task, who will take his courage in both hands and run risks, it offers unequalled opportunities for giving a hand in making a new and better world—in the only way that it can be done—by helping to make better men and women. It is a life which demands sacrifice—of course it is—for it is a life in close partnership with Christ, but, however great that sacrifice may be it is abundantly compensated by the glorious happiness of a life given simply to the service of God for the highest welfare of mankind.

In conclusion, we who have prepared this Report wish to assure Youth that our task has bred in us a new hope, and a new determination to run the race that is set before us more worthily of our high vocation. Some of us at least who have met together in this Lambeth Conference will not live to be present at another. The time is coming for us to hand on the torch to those who follow after us. We prepare to do so with penitence indeed for our own failures, but with the sure confidence that the race is being taken up by many who will run better than we have run. To them we would pass on a message of encouragement.

"God reigns" was the message which was given us at the opening service of our Conference, and the words were repeated by His Majesty King George at the end of his address to us. God reigns. It is for the coming of the kingdom, or reign, of God that we pray daily; and the task of every generation in turn is to strive to make the reign of God more real and actual in the world. But the Lord Jesus Himself said that a man must be born again of the Spirit before he could experience the reality of God's controlling will in the affairs of men. Through much toil and failure and humiliation we have each in his own way learnt the supreme need of this new birth. With ever new wonder and joy we have witnessed again and again the power of the Christian life which is truly inspired and led by the Spirit of God.

We would ask that none should suppose that we rely alone, or even first, upon the suggestions we have made in the earlier part of our Report for the solution of the problems with which we were dealing. We always and ever put first the conversion of the individual soul. It is the heart surrendered to God in love and service that changes the world and itself gets through to the very heart and meaning of life. Francis of Assisi, Joan of Arc, Henry Martyn, and a host of others who in the days of their youth dared to lose their lives and find them again in Christ remind us that the reign of God can anywhere and at any time become stupendously actual, wherever there are those who will take Him at His word and live in all its simplicity and beauty the life which He has revealed and given to us in Jesus Christ.

This indeed is the heart of our message. We offer Youth life in the name of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. We long to see, and we believe that we shall see, Youth in this generation take to itself and find ever new meaning in that glorious life which our Saviour has given us to live in Himself; that life which we all must ceaselessly strive to make our own until we can say with Saint Paul "No longer I, but Christ liveth in me."

If we have failed, yet God reigns; and our unconquerable faith is that God shall reign and His kingdom shall come more fully than ever before in the days that are now at hand. The evils of the present social order are indeed appalling, and seem to be well-nigh irremediable. But God reigns; we know it, because Christ reigned from the Tree. Love shewn forth in self-sacrifice is still the one truly irresistible force in the world; and love shall win. Here lies our hope. The Cross hurts, but when has Youth been afraid of pain? The Cross means self-giving to the uttermost, but has Youth ever stinted to give when it knew where and how to do so? Even in the midst of all the perplexities of the present time there is no real need for hesitation or despair. For God reigns, and Jesus lives; and those who have found God in Christ have won their freedom for ever from the tyranny of outward circumstances, and become new and creative agents, carving out for themselves new channels of life and service, and transforming the world around them by the power of their faith and self-sacrifice.

(Signed) A. F. LONDON:
*Chairman.*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY HARRISON AND SONS, LTD.,
PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY,
ST. MARTIN'S LANE, LONDON, W.C.2

Date Due

Mr 29 '43

[redacted]

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01186 7332